

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 074 514

CS 200 434

AUTHOR Bossone, Richard M.; Weiner, Max
TITLE Three Modes of Teaching Remedial English: A
 Comparative Analysis; A Pilot Study.
INSTITUTION City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Bernard Baruch Coll.;
 City Univ. of New York, N.Y. Graduate School and
 Univ. Center.
PUB DATE 73
NOTE 87p.

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Composition (Literary); Computer
 Assisted Instruction; *English Programs;
 Individualized Instruction; Programed Instruction;
 *Reading Instruction; Remedial Courses; Remedial
 Instruction; *Remedial Programs; Remedial Reading;
 Writing Skills

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study was to evaluate performance, backgrounds, attitudes, interests, academic needs, and problems of remedial English students at Baruch College of the City University of New York. The students were exposed to three instructional methods: computer-assisted instruction, programed instruction, and regular classroom instruction, specifically a linguistic approach. The study describes the objectives of the remedial courses in writing and reading skills, the three modes of instruction, and the materials and tests used, and it provides background information about the students and the factors contributing to their problems with English. Among the conclusions reached were that the majority of the students improved very little in writing ability, regardless of the instructional mode. It was recommended that greater emphasis be placed on the teaching of reading, better diagnostic procedures, individualized instruction, restructuring the remedial courses, providing tutorial services, and additional, more controlled research. Numerous tables, a detailed analysis of the data, and three appendixes, including the form for grading themes, the standards used in grading themes, and some unedited samples of student writing, are included. (Author/DI)

Three Modes of Teaching Remedial English:

A Comparative Analysis

by

Richard M. Bossone

and

Max Weiner

A Pilot Study

Sponsored by Baruch College and

The Graduate School of CUNY

1973

ED 074514

200 434

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Research endeavors are always shared by many persons who contribute more to the project than can ever be rewarded. This study is no exception. Nevertheless, to the extent that words are tribute, we acknowledge our appreciation to the following people who offered more assistance than anyone has the right to expect:

Dr. Allan Gross, Graduate Center of CUNY, and Ms. Karen Stekel, Baruch College, who gave invaluable aid in analyzing and tabulating the data.

Ms. Clara Arsenovich, Ms. Carol Caccese, Ms. Kathy Cavallo, Mr. Joseph Graf, Dr. Mary Hiatt, Mr. Frank Scimone, teachers at Baruch College, who conducted the classes for this study.

Dr. Frances Barasch, Baruch College, Dr. Charlotte Croman, Borough of Manhattan Community College, Ms. Pearl Gasarch, New York City Community College, and Dr. Mina Shaughnessy, City College, who spent hours reading and evaluating numerous themes.

And above all, the students who participated in this study and who also provided the challenge.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iii
LIST OF TABLES	vii
PART I - INTRODUCTION	1
The Problem	2
General Purpose and Objectives	3
PART II - PLAN AND PROCEDURE	4
Institutional Personnel and Testing Population Involved	4
General Description of the Remedial English Classes	5
Objectives of Remedial English Courses	5
Writing Skills - English 0.3	5
Reading Skills - English 0.3	6
Writing Skills - English 1.1	6
Reading Skills - English 1.1	6
Three Modes of Teaching Remedial English	6
Computer-Assisted Instruction	6
Programmed Instruction	9
A Linguistic Approach (Sector Analysis)	10
Materials and Tests Utilized in Study	12
Student Questionnaire	12
The Long Version Questionnaire	12
The Short Version Questionnaire	12
Reading Test	12
Pre- and Post-Tests on Gross Errors	12
Theme Record	12
Writing Samples	12
PART III - BARUCH COLLEGE STUDENTS OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK	17
Background Information	17
Sex, Marital Status, and Citizenship	17
Schooling and Socio-Economic Background	17
Vocational Goals	19
Extracurricular Activities and Interests	19
Outside Work	19
Social Activities and Personal Interests	22
Preferences in Reading and Literature	22
Student Attitudes and Opinions	29
Grammar	29
Writing	30
Academic Preparation	36
Academic Priorities and Expected Writing Demands	36
Placement	39

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Cont'd.)

	PAGE
Factors Contributing to Difficulties with English	44
Physical	44
Psychological-Intellectual	44
Environmental	44
Problems in Reading and Studying	50
Following Directions	50
Vocabulary	50
Comprehension and Study Skills	50
Critical Reading	50
PART IV - ANALYSIS OF DATA	59
Reading Test	59
Pre- and Post-Tests on Gross Errors	62
Comparison of Errors on Themes 1 and 8	62
Time on Computer and Theme Writing Achievement	64
Factors Noted by Teachers as a Problem	66
Comparison of Themes 1 and 8 for All Factors According to Mode of Instruction	66
PART V - SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	71
APPENDIXES:	
Appendix A. Theme Record	79
Appendix B. Composition Scale: Grading Standards	80
Appendix C. Unedited Samples of Student Writing	81

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1	Baruch College Students: Background Information	18
2	Vocational Goals: Pre- and Post-Questionnaires	20
3	Extracurricular Activities and Interests	23
4	Student Attitudes Regarding Grammar and Writing	31
5	Student Opinions Regarding Academic Preparation	37
6	Student Opinions Regarding Academic Priorities and Expected Writing Demands	40
7	Physical Factors Contributing to Problems with English	45
8	Psychological-Intellectual Factors Contributing to Problems with English	46
9	Environmental Factors Contributing to Problems with English	48
10	Problems in Reading and Studying: Following Directions	51
11	Problems in Reading and Studying: Vocabulary	52
12	Problems in Reading and Studying: Comprehension and Study Skills	53
13	Problems in Reading and Studying: Critical Reading	57
14	Reading Score Frequency Distribution	60
15	Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT) Results for 1.1 and 0.3 Groups	61
16	Pre- and Post-Test of Gross Errors	63
17	Comparison of Errors on Themes 1 and 8	65
18	Comparison of Overall Ratings and Sentence Structure Ratings on Themes 1 and 8, in Conjunction with Time Spent on Computer	67
19	Percentage of Occurrence of Each Factor Noted by Teacher as a Problem - Theme 1 vs. Theme 8	68
20	Comparison of Themes 1 and 8 for All Factors According to Mode of Instruction	70

THREE MODES OF TEACHING REMEDIAL ENGLISH: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Today more and more emphasis is being placed on faculty "productivity," not only by administrators and boards of education but also by the public and politicians who feel the need to justify educational expenditures. Unfortunately most people have a misguided notion of what constitutes "productivity." Witness one of the major issues during contract talks between the Professional Staff Congress (the faculty union of The City University of New York) and the negotiators for the University as reported in the New York Times on September 3, 1971.

The university has said that it will not agree to any cost increases that, in its opinion, are not "justified." It will not even submit a counter salary proposal until progress has been made on such related issues as increased faculty "productivity." For example, the university wants some flexibility in assigning to a faculty member a certain number of teaching hours in a week.

This, in our opinion, is clearly a misguided notion of what constitutes "productivity" on campus when one simply equates productivity with the number of hours one spends on the job. In academe, productivity should be equated primarily with outcomes of instruction, outcomes concerned not only with acquisition of subject matter competence but also with affective goals--attitudes, feelings, and values.

If this is the case, then, it becomes imperative that educators place their greatest emphasis upon evaluation of the progress of students rather than simply concentrating upon the number of hours a teacher spends on the job.

The Problem

Mass education at the college level is definitely the trend today in America and nowhere is it more evident than in New York with the open admissions plan of The City University of New York. As a result of this trend of open access in the post-secondary education system to every high school graduate, there has arisen in higher education two flatly opposed points of view as stated by Jacques Barzun at an all-day symposium on open admissions on October 29, 1971, at the Mayflower Hotel, Washington, D.C.:

One view...[puts] its faith in education and therefore democratically in open admissions as a means of raising the intellectual and socio-economic status of everybody in the country who can take advantage of the opportunities. The other view...[maintains] that education cannot possibly do this. The proponents believe that by letting as many as possible enter our various institutions of higher education a large crop of good material will emerge. The opponents doubt this and say that we should continue to be selective, regardless, of course, of socio-economic status but with close attention to intellectual capacity and motivation.

It is apparent, then, if we are ever to end this current debate raging over open admissions to higher education, we must engage in doing what many educators have avoided doing: make an analysis of instructional outcomes. Further, and more important, if we are to improve the quality of teaching and offer a justification for the ever-rising cost of an egalitarian approach to education, it is imperative that we engage in such analysis or stand the risk of perpetuating educational fraud. The question then is how might one begin along this hazardous path of analyzing educational outcomes. One approach might be to evaluate instructional results among alternate modes of instruction as given to open admissions students, more specifically those students in need of remedial English

who constitute the greatest number of potential dropouts. Thus, with this purpose in mind, this study was undertaken.

General Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study is to evaluate performance, backgrounds, attitudes, interests and academic needs, and problems of remedial English students exposed to three instructional treatments: Computer-Assisted Instruction (CAI), Programmed Instruction (PI), and regular classroom instruction, more specifically, a linguistic approach (LI).

Objectives relevant to the general purpose are:

1. To obtain background information about students enrolled in remedial English classes at Baruch College of The City University of New York (CUNY).
2. To note what their goals, interests, attitudes, and academic needs and problems are.
3. To examine achievement within and across groups.
4. To recommend possible courses of action for improving the teaching of these students.

PART II

PLAN AND PROCEDURE

Institutional Personnel and Testing Population Involved

To obtain data needed to accomplish the general purpose and objectives of this study, the investigators chose 13 remedial English classes at Baruch College of CUNY, six of which involved students who were generally in need of intensive remedial English instruction (English 0.3) and seven of which involved students who were generally in need of a fair amount of remediation instruction (English 1.1).

In these 13 classes the primary form of instruction was as follows:

- 8 involved Computer Assisted Instruction (CAI)
- 4 involved Programmed Instruction (PI)
- 1 involved a Linguistic Approach (LI)

Three of the CAI classes were at the 0.3 level and five were at the 1.1 level. Three of non-CAI classes were at a 0.3 level and two were at 1.1 level. Maximum number of students involved was 167; however, during the semester the number varied to a minimum total of 151.

Prior to the beginning of these classes in the spring semester, 1972, one of the investigators who is the Director of the Remedial English Program at Baruch College met with faculty members who were willing to participate in the study. These faculty members, including the Director, all had previous experience teaching these students and all had some special training in the area of teaching reading and writing skills. Of the seven faculty members involved, two had Ph.D.'s and the other five had M.A.'s and were enrolled in doctoral programs that included further study related to remedial or linguistic problems.

General Description of the Remedial English Classes

The remedial English classes at Baruch College are divided into sections for those in need of intensive remedial English instruction (0 point sequence) and into other sections at a higher level for those in need of less intensive remedial English instruction (1.1 & 1.2). Students are placed in these sections on the basis of an English placement examination, that is, an essay which they are required to write prior to registering for classes. The students' essays are read by at least two different members of the department before a judgment is made. Specific criteria for evaluating the students' writing is utilized (see Appendix B, p. 80).

These remedial English classes meet four hours a week in two-hour blocks. During the first hour, students are given intensive drill in grammar, punctuation, mechanics, and spelling via one of three modes of instruction (CAI, PI & LI) noted above. During the second hour, students are given group instruction and individual instruction (writing conference session, see p. 12) on how to write paragraphs and compositions. Instruction in reading is given via model paragraphs, compositions, and suitable pieces of literature.

Objectives of Remedial English Courses

For those students in need of intensive remedial English instruction (English 0.3) emphasis is placed primarily upon writing skills and secondarily upon reading skills. In particular, the following objectives pertaining to writing and reading skills are emphasized.

Writing Skills - English 0.3

- (1) to eliminate gross errors in composition (see list on p. 15)
- (2) to spell, punctuate, and employ standard English, according to accepted conventions of college writing

(3) to present ideas in clearly constructed sentences

(4) to develop and expand ideas into organized units of paragraphs and larger units of writing

Reading Skills - English 0.3

(1) to develop a vocabulary adequate for the understanding of the different subjects now being studied

(2) to comprehend the main idea of what is read

(3) to see relationships between ideas

(4) to summarize what is read

For students in need of a fair amount of remedial instruction (English 1.1) emphasis is also placed primarily upon the objectives pertaining to writing skills listed above and secondarily upon those objectives above pertaining to reading skills. In addition instructors emphasize the following:

Writing Skills - English 1.1

to organize and effectively express ideas in expository composition
to handle and control language as a method for expressing reason and emotion

Reading Skills - English 1.1

to understand the author's purpose in writing

to know how to evaluate critically the author's ideas and logic

Three Modes of Teaching Remedial English

A. Computer-Assisted Instruction

Definition of CAI

Computer-assisted instruction (CAI) is an educational innovation in which the student is guided by a computer through an organized but individualized and flexible course of instruction.

The computer is capable of recording a great deal of information and retrieving it at tremendous speed. Thus, CAI is the presentation of a wide range of information to students according to their needs with the aid of the computer.

The computer processes its programmed commands in terms of microseconds (one millionth of a second) while students are working in terms of seconds. The computer can therefore present different lessons and accept and evaluate answers from many students at the same time. The computer can also keep track of the student's daily performance. From this vast "memory" the computer selects and presents sequential lessons for the student's day-to-day performance.

The advantages of CAI are extensive: there is constant up-to-date diagnosis of the student's status; the student works at his own level of achievement at his own rate; there is immediate feedback to his responses and immediate reinforcement of learning in problem areas. These factors contribute to individualization of instruction and ultimately to more effective education.

Installation of CAI at Baruch College

On February 15, 1971, a special CAI terminal room was set up at the new Computer Center located on the 20th floor at 315 Park Avenue South. The CAI room has 15 IBM 2740 terminals in individual carrels for improved privacy. There are two classrooms adjacent where instruction is given in the format of the computerized curriculum.

The terminal, a typewriter-like machine, is the instrument through which the student communicates with the computer. These

terminals are connected by dial-up telephone lines to our IBM 360-40 computer in the main Computer Center. The memory of the computer is then divided into two partitions: the foreground in which the Basic English Program is stored and the other partition which serves administrative functions.

Definition of Coursewriter

The Coursewriter III System is a specialized CAI language designed to assist teachers in preparation of various courses or subject matter for students. The system is also designed to keep statistical data on each student and his progress through the course.

Basic English Program

The Basic English course is oriented to remedial instruction for open enrollment students. It is a course in English grammar and usage. The program's objective is to teach the remedial student to recognize and correct the gross errors that prevent him from writing good expository prose.

The program begins with the most basic concepts of language structure--nouns and verbs--and builds on them. The drill material is kept at the lowest reading level possible while maintaining a high-interest level of subject matter. The sentences used in the drill sections draw on the environment and experience of the modern urban student. Large quantities of drill material provide the student with concentrated practice on recognizing or correcting each of the gross writing errors.

Each student works at his own pace. The student's perform-

ance is evaluated at each step of his path through the program, and the diagnosis determines what he will do next.

B. Programmed Instruction

Programmed instruction is a method of teaching based on techniques developed by experimental psychologists for teaching complex behavior. Many facets represent, not a departure from, but merely a sharpening of procedures long recommended by educators. Psychologists have based programmed instruction on the following principles:

1. The pursuit of knowledge is an activity. If the student is to learn the material, he should respond to, participate in, or interact with it at every step.
2. Efficient learning requires that the student respond correctly, being guided towards proficiency by every technique or means available to the teachers.
3. The material must be presented in a rational and cumulative manner dependent on both the structure of the subject matter and the ability of the student to grasp it.
4. For effective learning, the student must be able to evaluate his own progress by being provided with knowledge of results immediately after each response.

The Handbook of Basic English Skills, a programmed textbook which reflects these principles and which was designed primarily for remedial English students who made gross errors in their writing, was used in and out of class by those instructors who taught their classes mainly by way of programmed instruction.

C. A Linguistic Approach (Sector Analysis)

This teaching mode is designed primarily for students who have problems with sentence structure and paragraph organization.

With regard to sentence structure, many of the notions of "traditional" grammar are not used. Instead, the method of teaching sentence structure avoids verbal definitions and rules as far as possible. Further, the sentence is considered the unit of study rather than words or parts of speech. In the foregoing ways, the approach is linguistic.

The theory underlying the method is a tagmemic one, originally enunciated by Kenneth Pike. In the tagmemic view, the combination of the form and the function of words and constructions are the accurate description of the language. For example, it is not enough for a student to be able to identify a prepositional phrase; the phrase and what its function is (modifier, complement, etc.) form the proper description of the language. The phrase "on the table" in the sentence, "The book on the table is mine" is a different "tagmeme" from the same phrase in the sentence, "The book is on the table."

The practical application of tagmemic theory has been largely developed by the inspiration and efforts of Robert L. Allen. Allen calls his system Sector Analysis. His premise is that English sentences have a normal word order and that, because of this fact, they can be considered as being comprised of a series of "sectors" or sections which are discovered structurally rather than by definition. Moreover, within each sector one or several constructions can occur. For example, the subject sector

may consist of a noun plus pre- and post-modifiers, or it may (rarely) consist of a prepositional phrase, or it may consist of a timeless verb construction, or it may consist of a clause:

1. The big, red book on the table is Harry's.
2. In the closet is out of bounds.
3. Being late to class can sometimes not be avoided.
4. What you become depends on many factors.

In Sector Analysis, the subject of a sentence is not "what the sentence is about"--rather it is what occurs in the subject sector of the sentence. The subject sector is easily discovered by a simple process of changing a statement into a question that can be answered by "Yes" or "No."

Statement: Many of us can tell right from wrong.

Yes-No Question: Can many of us tell right from wrong?

The word that changes in the order of the sentence to form the Yes-No question is called an X word. The words that occur between the two positions of the X word are the subject of the sentence: many of us. The cluster many of us occupies the subject sector of the sentence. In a sentence fragment, there is no way to shift an X word.

In this approach one uses several of the simpler, basic aspects of Allen's Sector Analysis. But much of the method described herein is the result of the teacher's own teaching experience with students who are deficient in the structural aspects of standard English. Therefore, the teacher devised new approaches and at times simplified the Allen method.

All exercises and drills, as well as those dealing with elimination of gross errors for this class, were written by the teacher of the course who intends to publish a book on the subject.

Writing Conference

The primary function of the writing conference which the instructor has with the student at least once a week is to give individual instruction and aid to the student. Assistance is given primarily through discussion of the writing assignment and work for that week with attention to progress made as recorded on the theme record sheets (see Appendix A, p. 79). As an example of a typical writing conference here is an explanation by one of the instructors:

During the writing conference session, I usually review specific papers, or parts of papers, with students. The emphasis is on clarification of rhetorical and grammatical errors so as to hopefully work out with the student a revision of, at least, major points of his paper. It is my hope to inspire the desire to reconstruct illogical, non-sequential thought and the desire to re-write works. I think the conference should be an opportunity to instill the feelings for complexities of the writing, re-writing situation. Usually we spend 20-30 minutes per session; ideally, more time should be spent with each student.

Materials and Tests Utilized in Study

Student Questionnaire

There were two versions of the student questionnaire which were administered to the students:

The Long Version Questionnaire (pre-form) consisted of 128 short questions, administered at the beginning of the term, designed to determine the student's social and educational back-

ground and goals, such as personal information including age, sex, high school diploma, health, parents' occupations, outside work and activities, vocational goals; self-evaluation of background in grammar, composition, speaking, reading, literature and spelling; opinions regarding various teaching strategies; and factors contributing to reading-study skills problems.

The Short Version Questionnaire (post-form) consisted of 29 short questions drawn from the long version, administered at the end of the term, designed to compare the results with the long questionnaire. Students were again polled on their attitudes regarding vocational goals; academic subject preferences, self-diagnosed difficulties with grammar, composition, speaking, reading, literature and spelling; and opinions regarding instructional techniques and strategies, including CAI.

Reading Test

The Advanced Reading Test, Form Am, of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., New York) was administered to all students involved in this study during the beginning of the spring term, 1972. Only the Word Knowledge Test and the Reading Test of the series were given.

The Word Knowledge Test is a 55-item vocabulary test. In each item the word to be defined is presented in a very brief sentence; the pupil selects from five choices the one which best completes the sentence, the correct choice most often being a synonym of the stimulus word. Emphasis is on knowledge of the literal meaning of words. The words tested are words that occur frequently in the reading of children in grades 7, 8, and 9. Performance on this test that is appreciably below the norm is an indication of the need for attention to vocabulary-building experiences.

EXAMPLE: A shrub is a. . . a) tree b) vine c) bush d) branch
e) shrug

The Reading Test consists of a series of reading selections, each followed by several questions designed to measure various aspects of reading comprehension, including:

- a. ability to select the main thought of a passage and to judge its general significance,
- b. ability to understand the literal meaning of the selection or to locate information explicitly set forth,
- c. ability to see the relationships among the ideas set forth in the selection and to draw correct inferences from the selection,
- d. ability to determine the meaning of a word from context or to judge from the context which of several possible meanings of a word is the appropriate one.

The selections are graduated in difficulty through control of vocabulary, sentence length and structure, and overall length. The questions based on each selection vary in difficulty but there is definite progression from easy to difficult as the pupil proceeds through the test. The time limit for the test is generous, so that little premium is placed on speed of reading as such. There are 44 questions.

The Word Knowledge Test is timed for 14 minutes and the Reading Test for 25 minutes. Most of the students completed both tests during the time allotted.

The score for each test is the number of right answers. Raw scores are converted to Grade Equivalents by means of a table conversion with extrapolated Grade Equivalent 12.9 as the maximum for each of the tests administered.

Pre- and Post-Tests on Gross Errors

A 25-item, multiple choice test was administered during the first

week of classes, designed to identify individual deficiencies within 12 gross error classifications:

1. The Run-On Sentence
2. The Sentence Fragment
3. Incorrect Principal Parts of the Verb
4. Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs
5. Lack of Agreement of Subject and Verb
6. Incorrect Case of Pronouns
7. Vague or Indefinite Pronominal Reference
8. Dangling Elements
9. Misplaced Modifiers
10. Errors in the Comparative Forms of Adjectives and Adverbs
11. Double Negatives
12. Lack of Agreement of Pronoun and Its Antecedent

Based on these test scores (corrected for guessing), the student was programmed for either three gross error packages or the entire Basic English course.

This test was also given during the last week of classes so that comparisons could be made between the student's initial and final performances.

Theme Record

Teachers were asked to keep theme record sheets on which they noted the number of sentences in each theme the students wrote and which gross errors the students made, along with the frequency with which they had been committed. Other factors used in appraising the students' writing are noted below. Students were required to write at least eight themes during the term.

Writing Samples

The writing samples (a short and a long theme) were judged on the basis of criteria which included the following factors: 1) organization; 2) ideas; 3) sentence structure; 4) diction; 5) punctuation, mechanics, and spelling. On the basis of these factors, judges decided whether or

not the short paper or the long paper was the better of the two. See Appendix B, p. 80, for detailed analysis of criteria. Judges were not told which sample was written at the beginning of the term or at the end of the term. In all instances, however, the shorter paper was written at the beginning of the term.

Four experienced and prominent teachers of composition, not involved in teaching the above classes at Baruch, judged the writing samples involved in this study in accordance with the criteria noted above.

PART III

BARUCH COLLEGE STUDENTS OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Background Information

Sex, Marital Status, and Citizenship (See Table 1)

This portion of the study was concerned with 164 students, 93 (56.71%) male, 70 (42.68%) female, and 1 (0.61%) student who did not indicate his/her sex. Of these students, 18 (10.98%) were married, 144 (87.80%) were single, and 2 (1.22%) did not respond. Most of these students, 141 (85.98%) were U.S. citizens, 21 (12.80%) were not, and 2 (1.22%) did not respond; however, only 17 (10.37%) were classified as "Foreign Students."

Schooling and Socio-Economic Background (See Table 1)

Of the original 164 students, 154 (93.94%) indicated that they were high school graduates, and 7 (4.27%) indicated that they were not. Of these students, 72 (43.90%) held Academic Diplomas, and the other students held types of diplomas in this order of frequency: General, 39 (23.79%); Commercial, 20 (12.19%); Vocational, 17 (10.37%); Technical, 8 (4.88%); Equivalency, 6 (3.66%).

Languages other than English spoken in their homes were in this order of frequency: Spanish, 45 (27.45%); Italian, 15 (9.15%); German, 4 (2.44%); French, 3 (1.83%); "Other," 18 (10.98%).

Many students indicated that their fathers' occupations were in the Laborer category, 41 (25.00%); other students indicated that their fathers' occupations were in the Blue Collar category, 31 (18.90%); White Collar category, 14 (8.54%); Professional category, 9 (5.49%); or Unemployed/Deceased, 23 (14.03%). Approximately forty-four percent of these students,

TABLE 1
BARUCH COLLEGE STUDENTS
Background Information

		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Sex	Male	15	48	61.16	11	9	43.48	8	53.33
	Female	12	27	37.86	12	12	52.17	7	<u>46.67</u>
Marital Status	Married	3	3	5.82	4	3	15.22	5	33.33
	Single	24	72	93.20	19	20	87.78	9	<u>60.00</u>
U.S. Citizen	Yes	24	68	89.32	20	18	82.61	11	73.33
	No	3	6	8.74	3	5	17.39	4	26.67
Foreign Student	Yes	3	5	7.77	3	4	15.22	2	13.33
	No	16	45	51.22	13	12	54.35	12	<u>80.00</u>
High School Graduate	Yes	28	73	98.06	23	17	86.96	13	86.67
	No		3	2.91		2	4.35	2	<u>13.33</u>
Type of Diploma	Academic	5	47	50.48	3	14	36.96	3	20.00
	General	11	11	21.36	7	2	19.57	3	53.33
	Commercial	2	9	10.68	4	3	15.22	2	13.33
	Vocational	9	3	11.65	4		8.69	1	6.67
	Technical	1	2	2.91	3	2	10.87		
	Equivalency		2	1.94	2	1	6.52	1	<u>6.67</u>
Language other than English spoken in the home	Spanish	10	12	21.34	5	11	34.78	7	46.6
	Italian	3	10	12.62	1	1	4.35		
	French	2		1.94	1		2.17		
	German		3	2.91		1	2.17		
	other	1	11	11.65	2	3	10.87	1	<u>6.6</u>
Father's Occupation	Unemployed/Deceased	5	10	14.56	6	2	17.39		
	Laborer	6	15	30.39	5	10	32.61	5	33.3
	Blue Collar	8	14	21.36	4	3	15.22	2	13.3
	White Collar	2	10	11.65	1	1	4.35		
	Professional		7	6.79	1	1	4.35		
Mother's Occupation	Unemployed/Deceased	12	33	43.69	8	13	42.65	6	40.9
	Laborer	3	7	9.71	5	5	21.74	2	13.3
	Blue Collar	5	11	15.53	3	2	10.87	1	6.6
	White Collar	3	8	10.68	2	1	6.25		
	Professional		3	2.91					<u>13.33</u>

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

72 (43.90%), indicated that their mothers were Unemployed/Deceased; the other students indicated that their mothers were employed in the following occupations: Blue Collar category, 22 (13.41%); Laborer category, 22 (13.41%); White Collar category, 14 (8.54%); Professional category, 5 (3.05%).

Vocational Goals (See Table 2)

Vocational goals were divided into 22 categories: Business, 81 (49.39%); Teaching, 15 (9.15%); Art, 8 (4.88%); Social Work, 6 (3.66%); Law, 6 (3.66%); Psychology, 5 (3.05%); Secretary, 4 (2.44%); Medicine, 3 (1.83%); Entertainment, 2 (1.22%); Music, 2 (1.22%); Police Science, 2 (1.22%); Data Processing, 1 (0.61%); Mathematics, 1 (0.61%); Mechanical Technology, 1 (0.61%); Nursing, 1 (0.61%); Writing, 1 (0.61%); or Other, 13 (7.92%). Dentistry, Hotel Technology, Ministry, Research, and Science did not appeal to any student at the beginning of the term.

When vocational goals were checked at the end of the semester, there seemed to have been no significant change in the order of originally popular goals: Business, 73 (48.34%); Teaching, 12 (7.95%); Social Work, 7 (4.63%); Psychology, 7 (4.63%); Law, 6 (3.97%); Secretary, 6 (3.97%); Art, 5 (3.31%); Medicine, 3 (1.99%); Data Processing, 3 (1.99%); Music, 3 (1.99%); Entertainment, 2 (1.32%); Mechanical Technology, 2 (1.32%); Mathematics, 1 (0.66%); Science, 1 (0.66%); Dentistry, 1 (0.66%); Police Science, 1 (0.66%); or Other, 12 (7.95%). Writing, Research, Ministry, Nursing, and Hotel Technology failed to appeal to students at the end of the term.

Extracurricular Activities and Interests

Outside Work (See Table 3)

More than one-third of these students, 65 (39.63%), were working

TABLE 2
VOCATIONAL GOALS
Pre-Questionnaire

GOAL	RESPONSE							
	CAI			PI			LI	
	0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Business	11	37	46.61	11	15	56.62	7	46.67
Teaching	4	5	8.74	2	3	10.87	1	6.67
Social Work		1	0.97	2	2	8.69	1	6.67
Law	1	5	5.82					
Psychology	1	2	2.91		1	2.17	1	6.67
Art		5	4.85	2	1	6.52		
Secretary	1	2	2.91				1	6.67
Medicine	1	2	2.91					
Entertainment		2	1.94					
Data Process-								
ing		1	0.97				1	6.64
Music		1	0.97				1	6.67
Dentistry	1		0.97					
Mathematics	1		0.97	1		2.17		
Writing	1		0.97					
Mechanical								
Technology		1	0.97					
Nursing	1		0.97					
Police Science	1		0.97				1	6.67
Science								
Research								
Hotel								
Technology								
Ministry								
Other	3	6	8.74	4		8.69		

*Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

TABLE 2

(continued)

VOCATIONAL GOALS
Post-Questionnaire

<u>GOAL</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>							
	<u>CAI</u>		%*	<u>PI</u>		%	<u>LI</u>	
	0.3	1.1		0.3	1.1		0.3	%
Business	9	34	45.94	10	12	52.38	8	53.33
Teaching	3	3	6.38	1	3	9.52	1	6.67
Social Work		3	3.19		1	2.38		
Law	1	5	6.38				1	6.67
Psychology	3	2	5.32		1	2.38	1	6.67
Art	1	1	2.13	2	1	7.14		
Secretary	3		3.19	3		7.14		
Medicine	1	2	3.19					
Entertainment		2	2.13					
Data Process- ing		3	3.19					
Music		2	2.13				1	6.67
Dentistry	1		1.06					
Mathematics				1		2.38		
Writing								
Mechanical Technology				1		2.38		
Nursing								
Police Science							1	6.67
Science				1		2.38		
Research								
Hotel Technology								
Ministry								
Other	3	6	9.57	2		4.76	1	6.67

*Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

while enrolled in the program; 91 (55.49%) were not working, and 8 (4.88%) did not respond. Of those students who worked 10 (15.15%) worked less than 8 hours per week; 14 (21.20%) worked between 8 and 12 hours weekly; 32 (48.45%) worked between 13 and 20 hours per week; and 12 (18.20%) worked more than 20 hours per week.

These figures did not change significantly at the end of the term: 68 (45.03%) were employed, while 80 (52.98%) were not; of those students who worked, 4.41% worked less than 8 hours per week; 8 (11.76%) worked between 8 and 12 hours per week; 33 (48.53%) worked between 13 and 20 hours per week; and 15 (22.06%) worked more than 20 hours per week.

Of the original 65 working students, 22 (33.33%) felt that the outside work interfered with their studies.

Social Activities and Personal Interests (See Table 3)

Extracurricular interests that seemed to appeal to these students were: TV, 29 (17.68%); Reading, 19 (11.58%); Athletic Events, 17 (10.37%); Parties, 17 (10.37%); Sports, 12 (7.42%); Movies, 11 (6.71%); Concerts, 11 (6.71%); Radio, 9 (5.49%); Dances, 6 (3.66%); Other, 14 (21.20%).

Preferences in Reading and Literature (See Table 3)

Nine (5.49%) of these students said that they did not like to read; 68 (45.03%) said that they did like to read; and 85 (51.83%) said that they liked to read sometimes. The students designated several types of literature as reading preferences: 116 (69.76%) preferred Short Stories; 113 (68.93%) preferred Novels; 103 (62.83%) preferred Magazine Articles; 91 (55.51%) preferred News; 87 (53.07%) preferred Newspaper Articles; 64 (39.04%) preferred Biographies; 64 (39.04%) preferred Technical Books; 42 (25.62%) preferred Essays; 40 (24.40%) preferred Poetry; 28 (17.08%) preferred Comic Books.

TABLE 3
EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI		%	PI		%	LI	
		0.3	1.1		0.3	1.1		0.3	%
Working (Pre Form)	Yes	8	35	41.75	9	9	39.13	4	26.67
	No	20	36	54.37	14	11	54.35	10	<u>66.67</u>
Working (Post Form)	Yes	10	35	47.87	8	10	42.86	5	33.33
	No	17	30	50.00	4	9	30.95	10	<u>66.67</u>
Time Occupied by work (Pre Form)	0-8 hrs.	4	3	0.16	1	2	6.52		
	8-12 "	1	10	0.24	0	1	2.17	2	13.33
	13-20 "	2	18	0.44	5	5	21.74	2	13.33
	20+ "	1	4	0.10	3	4	15.22		
Time Occupied by work (Post Form)	0-8 hrs.					1	2.38	2	13.33
	8-12 "		5	5.32	1	0	2.38	2	13.33
	13-20 "	6	14	21.28	5	7	28.57	1	6.67
	20+ "	2	10	12.76	2	1	7.14		
Work Interferes with studies	Yes	6	3	8.74	3	7	21.74	3	20.00
	No	6	12	17.47	9	31	86.96	3	<u>20.00</u>
Teach Reading (Pre Form)	Yes	24	49	70.87	19	18	80.44	11	73.33
	No	4	23	26.21	3	4	15.22	4	<u>26.67</u>
Teach Reading (Post Form)	Yes	21	45	70.21	17	15	76.19	13	86.67
	No	7	21	29.79	4	3	16.67	2	<u>13.33</u>

TABLE 3

(continued)

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Extra Curricular Activities	TV	7	6	12.62	8	7	32.61	1	6.67
	Reading	3	7	9.71	4	2	13.04	3	20.00
	Sports		9	8.74	3		6.52		
	Dances		4	3.88	1		2.17	1	6.67
	Athletic Events	6	8	13.59		1	2.17	2	13.33
	Movies	2	4	5.82		2	4.35	3	20.00
	Radio		6	5.82	1		2.17	2	13.33
	Parties	5	7	11.65	2	3	10.87		
	Concerts	1	5	5.82	1	3	8.69	1	6.67
	Other	3	9	11.65		2	4.35		
Like to Read	Yes	10	23	32.04	15	11	52.62	9	60.00
	Sometimes	14	45	57.28	8	12	43.48	6	40.00
	No	4	5	8.34					
Short Stories Preferred	Yes	20	50	67.96	19	17	78.26	10	66.67
	Somewhat	6	20	25.24	1	6	15.22	5	33.33
	No	1	4	4.85	3	6	19.57		
Magazine Articles Preferred	Yes	17	41	56.31	18	17	76.09	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	7	15.53	6	6	26.09	4	26.67
	No	2	26	27.18		1	2.17	1	6.67
News Preferred	Yes	16	38	52.43	16	12	60.87	9	60.00
	Somewhat	10	7	16.50	4	7	23.91	6	40.00
	No	2	27	28.15	3	2	10.87		
Newspaper Articles Preferred	Yes	16	36	50.48	14	11	54.35	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	10	18.45	5	10	32.61	4	26.67
	No	1	26	26.21	3	2	10.87	1	6.67

TABLE 3
(continued)

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

ITEM	RESPONSE	I			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Novels Preferred	Yes	14	55	66.99	14	20	73.91	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	5	13.59	6	3	19.57	3	20.00
	No	4	23	26.21	4	4	17.39	1	<u>6.67</u>
Technical Books Preferred	Yes	11	24	33.98	13	6	41.31	10	66.67
	Somewhat	10	30	38.88	7	10	36.96	4	26.67
	No	7	20	26.21	3	2	10.87	1	<u>6.67</u>
Plays Preferred	Yes	11	24	33.98	9	10	41.31	9	60.00
	Somewhat	12	26	36.89	9	7	34.78	4	26.67
	No	4	22	25.24	4	5	19.57	2	<u>13.33</u>
Essays Preferred	Yes	10	14	23.30	6	5	23.91	7	46.67
	Somewhat	10	20	29.13	13	11	52.17	6	40.00
	No	7	40	45.63	4	7	23.91	2	<u>13.33</u>
Biographies Preferred	Yes	10	32	40.78	5	11	34.78	6	40.00
	Somewhat	12	13	24.27	10	10	43.48	7	46.67
	No	6	28	33.01	8	6	30.44	2	<u>13.33</u>
Poetry Preferred	Yes	8	15	22.33	6	9	32.61	2	13.33
	Somewhat	11	34	43.69	10	4	30.44	11	73.33
	No	9	24	32.04	7	9	34.78	2	<u>13.33</u>
Comics Preferred	Yes	3	14	16.50	5	3	17.39	3	20.00
	Somewhat	10	28	36.89	10	10	43.48	4	26.67
	No	15	32	45.63	8	8	34.78	8	<u>53.33</u>
Emphasis	Short Stories	9	18	26.21	4	4	17.39	2	13.33
	Essays	8	13	20.39		5	10.87	1	6.67
	Novels	4	1	4.85		7	15.22	1	6.67
	Biographies	2	3	4.85					
	Plays	0	6	5.82				2	<u>13.33</u>

TABLE 3

(continued)

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
(Emphasis)	Magazine								
	Articles		15	14.56	7	2	19.57	4	26.67
	Poetry		2	1.94	5		10.87	2	13.33
	Newspaper								
	Articles		3	2.91				1	6.67
	News	2	2	3.88	2		4.35	1	6.67
	Technical								
	Books		2	1.94		2	4.35		
	Comics		1	0.97					
Newspapers (Subscribes)	N.Y. News	13	33	44.66	11	14	54.35	7	46.67
	N.Y. Times	8	17	24.27	3	3	13.04	1	6.67
	N.Y. Post	1	11	11.65	1		2.17	3	20.00
	None	5	8	12.62	5	7	26.09	2	13.33
Newspapers (Reads)	N.Y. News	8	16	23.31	6	5	23.91	2	13.33
	N.Y. Times	7	17	23.31	4	4	17.39	5	33.33
	N.Y. Post	4	18	21.36	7	3	21.74	3	20.00
	None	2	4	5.82	1	2	6.52	1	13.33
Favorite Section	Sports	6	28	33.01	4	3	15.22	5	33.33
	Front Page	9	11	19.42	8	8	34.78	1	6.67
	Features	1	11	11.65	2	5	15.22	1	6.67
	Editorial	2	9	10.68	7	1	17.39	1	6.67
	Amusements	4	5	8.74		1	2.17	4	26.67
	Business	2	1	2.91				1	6.67
	Specials	1	3	3.88	1	3	8.69	2	13.33
	Travel	2		1.94					

TABLE 3
(continued)

EXTRACURRICULAR ACTIVITIES AND INTERESTS

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Magazines Read	Life	9	20	28.15	5	2	15.22	3	20.00
	Reader's Digest		9	8.74	6	5	23.91	1	6.67
	Time	1	12	12.62	1	2	6.52	1	6.67
	(Look)	5	1	5.82	2	3	10.87	4	26.67
	Playboy	4	5	8.74	2	2	8.69		
	Newsweek	2	3	4.85		1	2.17	3	<u>20.00</u>
Preferred Subject	Sports	4	15	18.45	1	2	6.52	3	20.00
	Politics	3	15	17.47	2	1	6.52	1	6.67
	Education	5	8	12.62	5	2	15.22	1	6.67
	Crime	2	6	7.77	1	8	19.57	3	20.00
	Sex	4	8	14.65	1	1	4.35		
	Business	4	3	6.79	3		6.52	2	13.33
	Music		5	4.85	2	3	10.87	1	6.67
	Theatre	2	3	4.85	2	1	6.52	1	6.67
	Art		5	4.85	3		6.52	1	6.67
	Literature		1	0.97	1	1	4.35	2	<u>13.33</u>
Own Books (not text books)	Yes	21	57	75.73	12	21	71.74	1	6.67
	No	3	14	16.50	12	2	30.44	14	<u>93.33</u>
Have Library Card	Yes	20	53	70.89	18	17	76.09	12	80.00
	No	8	19	26.21	5	5	21.74	2	<u>13.33</u>
Borrows Books for Self-Use	Yes	3	20	22.33	6	7	28.26	2	13.33
	No	25	54	76.69	16	16	69.57	12	<u>80.00</u>
Number of Books Borrowed in Past Year	Less than 5	8	22	29.13	11	10	45.65	6	40.00
	6-10	13	28	39.80	5	7	26.09	5	33.33
	11-20	2	6	7.77	2	3	10.87		
	More than 20	2	10	11.65	1	1	4.35	2	<u>13.33</u>

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

** Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per student was given.

These students felt that emphasis should be placed on the following items: Short Stories, 37 (22.56%); Magazine Articles, 28 (17.08%); Essays, 27 (16.47%); Novels, 13 (7.93%); Poetry, 9 (5.49%); Plays, 8 (4.88%); News, 7 (4.27%); Technical books, 4 (2.44%); Newspaper Articles, 4 (2.44%).

The majority of these students, 112 (68.29%), own books other than school texts, while 45 (27.44%) do not.

Of the 120 students who had library cards, 57 (47.31%) borrowed less than 5 books during the year; 58 (48.14%) borrowed between 6 and 10 books; 13 (10.79%) borrowed more than 20 books. Thirty-eight (31.54%) of these students said that they borrowed books for their own use, while 123 (102.09%) said that these books were for school use. Some students gave multiple responses to these questions, causing the percentages to exceed 100%.

The majority of students either subscribed to or read these major newspapers on a regular basis: N.Y. News, 115 (70.12%); N.Y. Times, 52 (31.71%); N.Y. Post, 49 (29.88%); but 37 students (22.56%) stated that they neither subscribed to nor read any daily paper.

Favorite sections of the newspaper(s) were as follows: Sports, 46 (28.05%); Front Page, 37 (22.56%); Features, 20 (12.19%); Editorial, 20 (12.19%); Amusements, 14 (8.54%); Specials, 10 (6.09%); Business, 4 (2.44%); Travel, 2 (1.22%).

The majority of students read several magazines on a regular basis: Life, 39 (23.79%); Reader's Digest, 21 (12.80%); Time, 17 (10.36%); Look, 15 (9.15%); Playboy, 13 (7.92%); Newsweek, 9 (5.49%).

Preferred subjects were as follows: Sports, 25 (15.24%); Politics, 22 (13.41%); Education, 21 (12.80%); Crime, 20 (12.19%); Sex, 14 (8.54%); Business, 12 (7.32%); Music, 11 (6.71%); Theatre, 9 (5.49%); Art, 9

(5.49%); Literature, 5 (3.05%).

Initially the majority of these students, 121 (73.78%), felt that the course should offer reading instruction, while 38 (23.17%) felt that it should not. By the end of the term, these figures were essentially unchanged: 111 (73.51%) were in favor of including reading instruction in the course and 37 (24.50%) were not.

Student Attitudes and Opinions

Grammar (See Table 4)

The majority of these students, 90 (54.88%), stated that they did not like the study of grammar, while 69 (42.07%) said that they did. Perhaps this negative majority was due to the fact that 107 students (65.24%) admitted that they had problems in this area; 52 (31.72%) denied any problems with grammar; 103 (62.80%) felt that this course should concentrate on grammar, while 57 (34.77%) did not.

At the beginning of the term, students were asked to indicate helpful methods used to teach grammar; the results were as follows: Teacher Demonstrations, 146 (89.02%); Correction of Written Themes, 143 (87.19%); Workbooks, 140 (85.40%); Handbooks, 132 (80.52%); Class Quizzes, 131 (79.91%); Teacher Conferences, 130 (79.30%); Oral Reports/Speeches, 115 (70.12%); Programmed Instruction, 109 (66.39%); Computer Assisted Instruction, 97 (59.17%).

At the end of the term, the results were not significantly changed: Class Discussion, 142 (94.04%); Correction of Written Themes, 140 (92.68%); Teacher Demonstrations, 139 (92.05%); Workbooks, 137 (91.46%); Teacher Conferences, 132 (87.38%); Handbooks, 123 (81.45%); Class Quizzes, 122 (80.79%); Oral Reports/Speeches, 111 (73.51%); Programmed Instruction, 98

(64.24%); Computer Assisted Instruction, 92 (60.93%).

At the beginning of the term, students were asked to indicate the areas with which they had problems relating to grammar; the results were as follows: 93 (61.57%) acknowledged problems with correct usage; 89 (58.92%) indicated problems with punctuation, and 65 (39.63%) indicated problems with spelling.

By the end of the term, the results were as follows: correct usage, 87 (57.59%); punctuation, 65 (43.05%); spelling, 57 (37.73%).

Writing (See Table 4)

Approximately half of the students, 88 (53.66%), said that they liked to write, while 74 (45.12%) said that they did not; 96 (58.54%) indicated that they preferred help from the teacher while writing, but 65 (39.63%) rejected this kind of help; 73 (44.51%) of the students favored exchanging papers with classmates, but the majority, 88 (53.68%), rejected this system of evaluation. A large majority, 145 (88.41%) preferred conferences with the teacher, while 18 (10.97%) did not; 124 (75.61%) students opted for sample themes designated as "A," "B," and "C," but 32 (19.51%) did not like this system.

At the end of the term, these attitudes had not changed significantly: 79 (52.32%) students liked to write; 69 (45.69%) did not; 89 (58.94%) favored help from the teacher while writing; 55 (36.42%) did not; 92 (60.93%) preferred peer exchange and evaluation of papers, but 55 (36.42%) did not; 125 (82.75%) students indicated a preference for conferences with the teacher; 23 (14.23%) indicated no such preference. A large number of students, 115 (76.16%), preferred the sample themes; 21 (13.19%) did not.

TABLE 4

STUDENT ATTITUDES
Regarding Grammar and Writing

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Like Study of Grammar	Yes	16	20	34.95	14	10	52.17	9	60.00
	No	10	53	61.16	9	12	45.65	6	<u>40.00</u>
Any Problems in Grammar	Yes	22	43	63.11	16	15	67.39	11	73.33
	No	6	30	34.95	6	7	28.26	3	<u>20.00</u>
Should Course Concentrate On Grammar	Yes	21	41	60.19	20	11	67.39	10	66.67
	No	6	31	35.92	3	12	32.61	5	<u>33.33</u>
Workbooks Helpful (pre-form)	Yes	7	25	31.07	13	10	50.00	5	33.33
	Somewhat	14	40	52.43	8	11	41.31	7	46.67
	No	4	9	12.62		1	2.17	2	<u>13.33</u>
Teacher Demonstra- tion Helpful (pre-form)	Yes	14	26	38.83	13	10	50.00	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	40	49.57	9	11	43.48	4	26.67
	No	2	6	7.77		1	2.17		
Class discussion helpful (pre-form)	Yes	14	29	41.75	10	13	50.00	7	46.67
	Somewhat	11	29	38.83	10	8	39.13	5	33.33
	No	1	6	6.79	3	2	10.87	2	<u>13.33</u>
Handbooks helpful (pre-form)	Yes	8	18	25.24	7	5	26.09	5	33.33
	Somewhat	14	44	56.31	12	13	54.35	6	40.00
	No	3	11	13.59	3	4	15.22	3	<u>20.00</u>
PI Helpful (pre-form)	Yes	7	23	29.13	5	2	15.22	3	20.00
	Somewhat	10	28	36.89	8	14	47.83	9	60.00
	No	6	20	25.24	6	4	21.74	2	<u>13.33</u>
Correction of written themes help- ful (pre- form)	Yes	13	26	37.86	11	11	47.83	10	66.67
	Somewhat	7	42	47.57	8	10	39.13	5	33.33
	No	4	5	8.74	4	2	15.22		

TABLE 4
(continued)

STUDENT ATTITUDES
Regarding Grammar and Writing

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Class quizzes helpful (pre-form)	Yes	10	13	22.33	5	8	28.26	9	60.00
	Somewhat	10	45	53.39	16	12	82.61	3	20.00
	No	4	16	19.42	2	2	8.69	2	<u>13.33</u>
Oral reports/speeches helpful (pre-form)	Yes	5	18	22.33	9	6	32.61	6	40.00
	Somewhat	11	36	45.63	8	9	36.96	7	46.67
	No	9	18	26.21	5	7	26.09	1	6.67
Teacher conferences helpful (pre-form)	Yes	14	33	45.63	11	7	39.13	8	53.33
	Somewhat	8	27	33.98	6	10	34.78	6	40.00
	No		13	12.62	4	5	19.57		<u> </u>
CAI helpful (pre-form)	Yes	8	30	36.89	1	6	15.22	3	20.00
	Somewhat	8	19	26.21	5	10	32.61	7	46.67
	No	8	21	28.15	4	7	23.91	1	<u>6.67</u>
Workbooks helpful (post-form)	Yes	10	18	29.79	13	14	64.28	3	20.00
	Somewhat	16	43	62.76	9	4	30.95	8	53.33
	No	2	5	7.45		1	4.76	2	<u>13.33</u>
Teacher demonstration helpful (post-form)	Yes	16	31	50.00	17	14	73.81	12	80.00
	Somewhat	11	28	41.49	5	3	19.05	2	13.33
	No	1	4	5.32	3	1	9.52		<u> </u>
Class discussion helpful (post-form)	Yes	16	32	51.06	12	14	61.90	11	73.33
	Somewhat	10	32	44.68	8	5	30.95	2	13.33
	No	2	1	3.19	3		7.14		<u> </u>
Handbooks helpful (post-form)	Yes	9	13	23.40	11	7	42.86	2	13.33
	Somewhat	11	45	59.57	8	9	40.47	8	53.33
	No	9	6	15.96	3	2	11.90	3	<u>20.00</u>

TABLE 4
(continued)
STUDENT ATTITUDES
Regarding Grammar and Writing

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
PI helpful (post-form)	Yes	8	23	32.98	5	1	14.28	4	26.67
	Somewhat	13	26	41.49	8	7	35.71	3	20.00
	No	5	14	20.21	4	6	23.81	4	<u>26.67</u>
Correction of written themes helpful (post-form)	Yes	9	31	42.55	12	9	50.00	11	73.33
	Somewhat	18	29	43.62	8	10	42.86	3	20.00
	No	1	7	8.51	3		7.14	1	<u>6.67</u>
Class quizzes helpful (post-form)	Yes	8	17	26.59	10	3	30.95	3	20.00
	Somewhat	14	35	52.13	11	12	54.76	9	60.00
	No	5	14	20.21	1	2	7.14	2	<u>13.33</u>
Oral reports/ speeches helpful (post-form)	Yes	7	14	22.34	2	3	11.90	3	20.00
	Somewhat	15	35	51.19	15	11	61.90	6	40.00
	No	5	15	21.28	3	4	16.67	4	<u>26.67</u>
Teacher conference helpful (post-form)	Yes	15	30	47.87	15	8	54.76	10	66.67
	Somewhat	11	23	36.17	4	11	35.71	5	33.33
	No	2	10	12.76	1		2.38		
CAI helpful (post-form)	Yes	13	25	40.42	2	1	7.14		
	Somewhat	10	23	35.11	7	5	28.57	6	40.00
	No	5	18	13.83	6	6	28.57	6	<u>40.00</u>
Spelling problems (pre-form)	Yes	15	24	37.86	10	9	41.31	7	46.67
	No	8	47	53.39	15	14	63.04	6	<u>40.00</u>
Punctuation problems (pre-form)	Yes	18	37	53.39	14	10	52.17	10	66.67
	No	5	34	37.86	7	13	43.48	4	<u>26.67</u>
Usage problems (pre-form)	Yes	11	38	47.57	17	15	69.57	12	80.00
	No	15	31	44.66	6	8	30.44	3	<u>20.00</u>

TABLE 4
(continued)
STUDENT ATTITUDES
Regarding Grammar and Writing

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Teacher conferences (post-form)	Yes	25	59	89.36	21	5	61.90	15	100.00
	No	3	16	20.21	1	3	9.52		
Sample themes (post-form)	Yes	20	52	76.59	15	15	71.43	13	86.67
	No	5	8	13.83	6	2	19.05		
Where do you prefer to write (pre-form)	In Class	6	16	21.36		2	4.35	2	13.33
	Outside								
	Class	5	30	33.98	4	7	23.91	2	13.33
	Both	17	27	42.72	18	14	69.57	11	73.33
Where do you prefer to write (post-form)	In Class	8	8	17.02	4	1	11.90	3	20.00
	Outside								
	Class	10	22	39.36	11	9	47.62	9	60.00
	Both	10	29	41.49	7	9	38.09	2	13.33
English important for success	Yes	24	59	80.58	22	18	86.96	14	93.33
	No	2	13	14.56	1	3	8.69		

TABLE 4
(continued)
STUDENT ATTITUDES
Regarding Grammar and Writing

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Spelling problems (post-form)	Yes	15	20	37.23	9	6	35.71	7	46.67
	No	13	42	58.51	9	11	47.62	7	<u>46.67</u>
Punctuation problems (post-form)	Yes	15	30	47.87	9	6	35.71	5	33.33
	No	13	33	48.94	9	8	40.47	8	<u>53.33</u>
Usage problems (post-form)	Yes	22	34	59.57	13	11	57.14	6	40.00
	No	4	30	36.17	7	6	30.95	7	<u>46.67</u>
Like to write (pre-form)	Yes	13	41	52.43	12	14	56.62	8	53.33
	No	15	32	45.63	11	9	43.48	7	<u>46.67</u>
Help from teacher (pre-form)	Yes	20	40	58.25	14	12	56.52	10	66.67
	No	7	33	38.83	9	11	43.48	5	<u>33.33</u>
Peer exchange (pre-form)	Yes	12	36	46.60	7	11	39.13	7	46.67
	No	16	36	49.51	16	12	60.87	8	<u>53.33</u>
Teacher conferences (pre-form)	Yes	25	61	83.49	23	21	95.65	15	100.00
	No	3	13	15.53		2	4.35		
Sample themes (pre-form)	Yes	22	55	74.76	18	14	69.57	13	86.67
	No	6	16	21.36	3	7	21.74		
Like to write (post-form)	Yes	12	31	45.74	13	14	64.28	9	60.00
	No	15	34	52.13	9	5	33.33	6	<u>40.00</u>
Help from teacher (post-form)	Yes	23	38	64.89	13	7	47.62	8	53.33
	No	5	25	31.91	8	11	45.24	6	<u>40.00</u>
Peer exchange (post-form)	Yes	18	42	63.83	11	11	52.38	10	66.67
	No	9	23	34.02	10	8	42.85	5	<u>33.33</u>

*Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

*Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per student was given.

At the beginning of the term, 26 students (15.85%) indicated a preference for writing in class; 48 (29.27%) preferred to write outside of class; and 87 (53.05%) favored using both approaches.

By the end of the term, there was a slight increase in the popularity of writing outside of class, 66 (40.24%). The other figures were not significantly different from what they had been: 24 (15.89%) favored writing in class and 57 (37.75%) favored a combination of both in class and outside of class writing.

One hundred and thirty-seven students (83.54%) were of the opinion that English is important in achieving professional success, but 19 (11.58%) felt that it is not so important.

Academic Preparation (See Table 5)

The students were asked to evaluate the adequacy of their high school preparation in six areas; the results were as follows:

Grammar	- 37 (22.56%) Poor; 81 (49.39%) Fair; 41 (25.00%) Good; 2 (1.22%) Excellent.
Composition	- 27 (17.69%) Poor; 78 (47.58%) Fair; 46 (28.05%) Good; 10 (6.09%) Excellent.
Speaking	- 15 (9.15%) Poor; 69 (42.07%) Fair; 66 (40.24%) Good; 12 (7.31%) Excellent.
Reading	- 19 (11.58%) Poor; 69 (42.07%) Fair; 75 (45.75%) Good; 16 (9.76%) Excellent.
Literature	- 16 (9.76%) Poor; 69 (42.07%) Fair; 65 (39.63%) Good; 13 (7.93%) Excellent.
Spelling	- 26 (15.85%) Poor; 66 (40.24%) Fair; 52 (31.71%) Good; 18 (10.97%) Excellent.

Academic Priorities and Expected Writing Demands (See Table 6)

The students were asked to indicate which of the six areas was most difficult for them and then to select the one in which they felt most competent; the results were as follows:

TABLE 5
STUDENT OPINIONS
Regarding Academic Preparation

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Grammar Background	Poor	12	10	21.36	4	8	26.09	3	20.00
	Fair	11	43	52.42	13	8	45.65	6	40.00
	Good	4	22	25.24	6	5	23.91	4	26.67
	Excellent		2	1.94					
Composition Background	Poor	10	9	18.45	4	3	15.22	1	6.67
	Fair	13	34	45.63	9	13	47.83	9	60.00
	Good	3	27	29.13	8	6	30.44	2	13.33
	Excellent	1	5	5.82	2	1	6.52	1	6.67
Speaking Background	Poor	4	7	10.68	1	2	6.52	1	6.67
	Fair	16	30	44.66	7	10	36.96	6	40.00
	Good	6	32	36.89	11	11	47.83	6	40.00
	Excellent	1	6	6.79	4		8.69	1	6.67
Reading Background	Poor	7	5	11.65	1	3	6.52	3	20.00
	Fair	12	34	34.95	12	9	45.65	2	13.33
	Good	8	33	39.80	15	11	56.62	8	53.33
	Excellent	1	13	13.59	1		2.17	1	6.67
Literature Background	Poor	6	5	10.68	3	1	8.69	1	6.67
	Fair	14	23	35.92	11	14	54.35	7	46.67
	Good	7	38	43.69	9	16	54.35	5	33.33
	Excellent	1	9	9.71		2	4.35	1	6.67
Spelling Background	Poor	7	9	15.53	5	4	19.57	1	6.67
	Fair	13	31	42.72	8	10	39.13	4	26.67
	Good	6	26	31.07	5	8	28.26	7	46.67
	Excellent	2	9	10.68	3	1	8.69	3	20.00

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

** Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per student was given.

Grammar	-	59 (35.97%)	Difficult; 17 (10.42%)	Competent
Composition	-	56 (34.14%)	Difficult; 26 (15.85%)	Competent
Reading	-	12 (7.32%)	Difficult; 33 (20.13%)	Competent
Speaking	-	7 (4.27%)	Difficult; 48 (29.27%)	Competent
Spelling	-	15 (9.15%)	Difficult; 24 (14.68%)	Competent
Literature	-	6 (3.66%)	Difficult; 6 (3.66%)	Competent

At the end of the term, there were few significant changes:

Grammar	-	61 (40.39%)	Difficult; 17 (11.26%)	Competent
Composition	-	46 (30.46%)	Difficult; 21 (13.91%)	Competent
Reading	-	5 (3.31%)	Difficult; 46 (30.46%)	Competent
Speaking	-	8 (5.29%)	Difficult; 31 (20.52%)	Competent
Spelling	-	15 (9.93%)	Difficult; 26 (17.22%)	Competent
Literature	-	8 (5.29%)	Difficult; 7 (4.63%)	Competent

From these areas, the students were instructed to select the one which they felt should be stressed in this course; the results were as follows:

Composition	-	64 (39.04%)
Grammar	-	53 (32.32%)
Speaking	-	15 (9.15%)
Reading	-	10 (6.09%)
Spelling	-	7 (4.27%)
Literature	-	1 (0.61%)

These students were then asked to indicate the type of writing in which they were most competent from among four categories:

Expository	-	42 (25.61%)
Narrative	-	51 (31.09%)
Descriptive	-	39 (23.78%)
Persuasive	-	27 (16.46%)

At the end of the term, they were again asked to select one of the four types of writing in which they felt most competent:

Expository	-	26 (17.22%)
Narrative	-	45 (29.80%)
Descriptive	-	34 (22.52%)
Persuasive	-	39 (25.83%)

These students were asked to select one of these four types of writing which they felt should be emphasized in this course. At the beginning of the term, the results were as follows:

Expository	-	63 (38.41%)
Narrative	-	20 (12.19%)
Descriptive	-	26 (15.85%)
Persuasive	-	27 (16.46%)

At the end of the term, the results were essentially unchanged:

Expository	-	49 (32.45%)
Narrative	-	27 (16.46%)
Descriptive	-	24 (14.48%)
Persuasive	-	39 (26.23%)

At the beginning of the term, the students were asked to select the type of writing that they expected to be doing most often after graduation. The results were as follows: Business Reports, 49 (30.50%); Business Letters, 41 (25.00%); Personal Letters, 16 (9.76%); Speeches, 16 (9.76%); Technical/Scientific Writing, 9 (5.49%); Short Stories, 4 (2.44%); Novels, 2 (1.22%); Magazine Articles, 1 (0.61%); Newspaper Articles, 1 (0.61%); and None, 14 (8.54%).

By the end of the term, the order of projected priorities had remained essentially unchanged: Business Reports, 41 (27.14%) and Business Letters, 38 (25.16%) were still the areas most frequently cited. The other areas were in the following order of frequency: Personal Letters, 22 (14.57%); Speeches, 10 (6.62%); Technical/Scientific Writing, 6 (3.97%); Short Stories, 6 (3.97%); Magazine Articles, 4 (2.65%); Novels, 1 (0.66%); Newspaper Articles, 1 (0.66%); None, 13 (8.61%).

Placement

Students were asked whether or not they felt that they had been properly placed in a remedial class. At the beginning of the term and at the end of the term, the results were rather interesting; initially, 112 (68.29%) felt that they had been properly placed, but 49 (29.89%) did not. At the end of the term, 122 (80.79%) felt that the placement was correct, while only 22 (14.57%) did not feel this way.

TABLE 6

STUDENT OPINIONS
Regarding Academic Priorities
and Expected Writing Demands

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Grammar (pre-form)	Difficult	8	32	38.83	7	9	34.78	3	20.00
	Competent	3	7	9.71	1	4	10.87	2	<u>13.33</u>
Composition (pre-form)	Difficult	13	25	36.89	1	8	19.57	9	60.00
	Competent	4	9	12.62	5	5	21.74	3	<u>20.00</u>
Speaking (pre-form)	Difficult	1	2	2.91	2	1	6.52	1	6.67
	Competent	10	22	31.07	7	6	28.26	3	<u>20.00</u>
Reading (pre-form)	Difficult	4	3	6.79	1	4	10.87		
	Competent	4	17	20.39	6	3	19.57	3	<u>20.00</u>
Literature (pre-form)	Difficult		5	4.85	1		2.17		
	Competent	2	3	4.85	1		2.17		
Spelling (pre-form)	Difficult	2	6	7.77	4	1	10.87	2	13.33
	Competent	1	12	12.62	2	5	15.22	4	26.67
Grammar (pre-form)	Difficult	11	26	39.36	10	9	41.31	5	33.33
	Competent	2	8	10.64	3	1	8.69	3	<u>20.00</u>
Composition (post-form)	Difficult	10	19	30.85	5	4	21.43	8	53.33
	Competent	4	5	9.57	5	4	21.43	3	<u>20.00</u>
Speaking (post-form)	Difficult	2	3	5.32	2	1	7.14		
	Competent	5	16	22.34	3	3	14.28	4	<u>26.67</u>
Reading (post-form)	Difficult	1	2	3.19		2	4.76		
	Competent	12	16	29.79	8	8	38.09	2	<u>13.33</u>

TABLE 6
(continued)

STUDENT OPINIONS
Regarding Academic Priorities
and Expected Writing Demands

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Literature (post-form)	Difficult	1	6	7.45	1		2.38		
	Competent	1	3	4.25	1	1	4.76	1	<u>6.67</u>
Spelling (post-form)	Difficult	2	3	5.32	5	3	19.05	2	13.33
	Competent	2	19	22.34	2	2	9.52	1	<u>6.67</u>
Topics to be Stressed	Composition	12	31	41.75	8	4	26.09	9	60.00
	Grammar	8	25	32.04	9	7	34.78	4	26.67
	Speaking	4	7	10.69	2	2	8.69		
	Reading	3	6	8.74		1	2.17		
	Spelling		2	1.94	3		6.52	2	13.33
	Literature		1	0.97					
Expository Competency	Pre-form	9	23	31.07	5	3	17.39	2	13.33
	Post-form	5	10	15.96	3	5	19.05	3	<u>20.00</u>
Narrative Competency	Pre-form	10	19	28.15	8	7	32.61	7	46.67
	Post-form	6	23	30.85	8	3	26.19	5	<u>33.33</u>
Descriptive Competency	Pre-form	4	18	21.36	5	8	28.26	4	26.67
	Post-form	11	8	20.21	6	6	28.57	3	<u>20.00</u>
Persuasive Competency	Pre-form	3	13	15.53	5	4	19.57	2	13.33
	Post-form	6	20	27.66	4	5	21.43	4	<u>26.67</u>
Expository Emphasis	Pre-form	13	27	38.83	10	7	36.96	6	40.00
	Post-form	10	20	31.91	10	5	35.71	4	<u>26.67</u>
Narrative Emphasis	Pre-form	4	8	11.65	4	1	10.87	3	20.00
	Post-form	6	13	20.21	3	3	14.28	2	<u>13.33</u>
Descriptive Emphasis	Pre-form	3	16	18.45	4	2	13.04	1	6.67
	Post-form	6	8	14.89	5	2	16.67	3	<u>20.00</u>

TABLE 6
(continued)

STUDENT OPINIONS
Regarding Academic Priorities
and Expected Writing Demands

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI		%*	PI		%	LI	
		0.3	1.1		0.3	1.1		0.3	%
Persuasive Emphasis	Pre-form	7	7	13.59	2	9	23.91	2	13.33
	Post-form	4	21	26.59	4	5	21.43	5	<u>33.33</u>
Business Reports	Pre-form	7	22	28.15	6	8	30.44	6	40.00
	Post-form	8	19	28.72	5	4	21.43	5	<u>33.33</u>
Business Letters	Pre-form	9	20	28.15	5	6	23.91	1	6.67
	Post-form	6	18	25.53	6	6	28.57	2	<u>13.33</u>
Personal Letters	Pre-form	3	7	9.71	4	1	10.87	1	6.67
	Post-form	4	9	13.83	2	4	14.28	3	<u>20.00</u>
Speeches	Pre-form	3	5	7.77	1	2	6.52	5	33.33
	Post-form	3	4	7.45	2	1	7.14		
Technical Scientific	Pre-form	3	3	5.82	3		6.52		
	Post-form	1	2	3.19	2	1	7.14		
Short Stories	Pre-form	1	2	2.91				1	6.67
	Post-form		4	4.25	1	1	4.76		
Novels	Pre-form		1	0.97		1	2.17		
	Post-form		1	1.06					
Magazine Articles	Pre-form		1	0.97					
	Post-form	2	2	4.25					
Newspaper Articles	Pre-form		1	0.97					
	Post-form		1	1.06					
None	Pre-form	2	5	6.79	3	3	13.04	1	6.67
	Post-form	2	7	9.57	3	1	9.52		

TABLE 6
(continued)

STUDENT OPINIONS
Regarding Academic Priorities
and Expected Writing Demands

ITEM	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI		
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	1.1	%
Properly Placed (pre-form)	Yes	22	44	64.08	18	15	71.74	13	86.67	
	No	5	31	34.95	3	8	25.91	2	13.33	
Properly Placed (inst-form)	Yes	21	52	77.66	20	17	88.09	12	80.00	
	No	5	11	17.02	1	2	7.14	3	20.00	

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

Factors Contributing to Difficulties with English

Physical (See Table 7)

The overwhelming majority of these students, 130 (79.25%), indicated that they had no physical problems; but 135 (82.30%) indicated they were tired often or sometimes.

Psychological-Intellectual (See Table 8)

Although the majority of students, 103 (62.80%), denied having any personal problems, 104 (63.41%) did admit to having some difficulty doing school work, as well as problems in the following areas: comprehension, 128 (78.05%); concentration, 116 (70.73%); anxiety about reading ability, 106 (64.63%).

Environmental (See Table 9)

The majority of these students, 122 (74.42%), indicated one or more negative factors relating to environment. The most common factors were as follows: 122 (74.42%) having had high school teachers who were only somewhat interested in teaching reading skills; 112 (68.32%) having relatives or friends who did not or only somewhat encouraged an interest in reading; 107 (65.97%) having parents who spent or only occasionally spent their leisure time reading, and 105 (64.05%) living in a home situation which did not, or only somewhat stimulated an interest in reading.

It should be noted that these negative factors had an adverse affect on the students' reading interests because 109 (66.49%) indicated that they did not or only somewhat liked to read, and 112 (68.32%) stated that they did not read much outside of school work.

TABLE 7

PHYSICAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROBLEMS WITH ENGLISH

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI		%*	PI		%	LI	
		0.3	1.1		0.3	1.1		0.3	%
Do you have a physical handicap?	Yes		5	4.85	2	3	10.87		
	Somewhat	4	2	5.82		1	2.17	1	6.67
	No	24	58	79.61	20	19	84.78	9	<u>60.00</u>
Do you have a speech handicap?	Yes	1	10	10.68	1		2.17	1	6.67
	Somewhat	1	5	5.82	2	5	15.22	5	33.33
	No	26	58	81.55	20	18	82.61	9	<u>60.00</u>
Are you frequently ill?	Yes	1	4	4.85				1	6.67
	Somewhat	1	12	12.62	1	5	13.04	3	20.00
	No	22	59	78.64	22	18	86.96	11	<u>73.33</u>
Are you frequently tired?	Yes	4	13	16.50	1	4	10.87	1	6.67
	Somewhat	11	26	35.92	9	7	34.78	5	33.33
	No	13	34	45.63	13	11	52.17	9	<u>60.00</u>
Is your vision good?	Yes	18	50	66.02	14	14	60.87	8	53.33
	Somewhat	5	13	17.47	6	7	28.26	3	20.00
	No	4	11	14.56	3	2	10.87	4	<u>26.67</u>
Is your hearing good?	Yes	24	60	81.55	17	20	80.44	11	73.33
	Somewhat	1	4	4.85	4		8.69	2	13.33
	No	1	9	9.71	1	2	6.52	1	<u>6.67</u>
Are you in good physical condition?	Yes	22	49	68.93	17	15	69.57	12	80.00
	Somewhat	2	14	15.53	4	8	26.09	2	13.33
	No	3	10	12.62	2		4.35	1	<u>6.67</u>

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

TABLE 8

PSYCHOLOGICAL-INTELLECTUAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO
PROBLEMS WITH ENGLISH

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Do you have any personal problems?	Yes	12	14	25.24	7	8	32.61	2	13.33
	No	13	48	59.22	15	14	63.04	13	<u>36.67</u>
Do you have difficulty doing school work?	Yes	8	8	15.53	3	2	10.87		
	Somewhat	11	40	49.51	11	14	54.35	7	46.67
	No	9	27	34.95	9	7	34.78	8	<u>53.33</u>
Do you worry about previous or present poor grades?	Yes	10	16	25.24	6	6	26.09	3	20.00
	Somewhat	11	20	30.09	6	11	36.96	5	33.33
	No	7	39	44.66		5	10.87	7	<u>46.67</u>
Do you worry about your reading ability?	Yes	13	13	25.24	6	6	26.09	7	46.67
	Somewhat	11	28	37.86	6	12	39.13	4	26.67
	No	4	34	36.89	11	5	34.78	4	<u>26.67</u>
Do you have trouble concentrating on what you are reading?	Yes	13	17	29.13	5	6	23.91	5	33.33
	Somewhat	8	33	39.80	9	12	45.65	8	53.33
	No	7	25	31.07	9	4	28.26	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do you understand all that you read?	Yes	9	27	34.95	6	8	30.44	1	6.67
	Somewhat	12	33	43.69	9	12	45.65	10	66.67
	No	7	15	21.36	8	2	21.74	4	<u>26.67</u>
Are you as intelligent as your classmates?	Yes	14	44	56.31	11	6	36.96	10	66.67
	Somewhat	7	24	30.09	7	8	32.61	2	13.33
	No	7	8	14.56	6	2	17.39	2	<u>13.33</u>

TABLE 8
(continued)

PSYCHOLOGICAL-INTELLECTUAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO
PROBLEMS WITH ENGLISH

<u>QUESTION</u>	<u>RESPONSE</u>	<u>CAI</u>			<u>PI</u>			<u>LI</u>	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Do you want to be someone else?	Yes	6	13	18.45	2	4	13.04	1	6.67
	Sometimes	1	12	12.62				1	6.67
	No	20	50	67.96	20	18	82.61	11	<u>73.33</u>

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

TABLE 9

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROBLEMS

WITH ENGLISH

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI		%*	PI		%**	LI	
		0.3	1.1		0.3	1.1		0.3	%
Is your home situation stimulating?	Yes	8	26	33.01	11	5	34.78	6	40.00
	Somewhat	5	24	28.15	7	10	36.96	6	40.00
	No	11	24	33.98	7	8	32.01	3	<u>20.00</u>
Do you have a quiet place at home to study?	Yes	14	46	58.25	13	14	58.69	8	53.33
	Somewhat	10	13	22.33	4	5	19.57	3	20.00
	No	4	13	16.50	6	4	21.74	4	<u>26.67</u>
Are you able to get reading materials that interest you?	Yes	17	56	70.87	16	16	69.57	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	15	23.31	5	6	23.91	2	13.33
	No	2	1	2.91	2	1	6.52	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do your parents spend leisure time reading?	Yes	9	19	27.18	8	6	30.44	9	60.00
	Somewhat	14	26	38.83	9	11	43.48	4	26.67
	No	5	25	29.13	6	6	26.09	1	<u>6.67</u>
Significant others encouraged your reading interest?	Yes	7	19	25.24	5	8	28.26	10	66.67
	Somewhat	9	28	35.92	9	7	34.78	3	20.00
	No	12	25	35.92	9	8	36.96	2	<u>13.33</u>
High School Teachers interested in Teaching Reading Skills?	Yes	2	16	17.47	7	7	30.44	5	33.33
	Somewhat	17	30	45.63	6	8	30.44	8	53.33
	No	8	25	32.04	10	8	39.13	2	<u>13.33</u>

TABLE 9
(continued)

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS CONTRIBUTING TO PROBLEMS
WITH ENGLISH

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LJ	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Do you like to read?	Yes	8	27	33.98	6	5	23.91	10	66.67
	Somewhat	12	39	49.51	8	15	50.00	4	26.67
	No	7	12	18.45	8	3	23.91	1	6.67
Do you read much (outside of school work)?	Yes	12	17	28.15	8	10	39.13	3	20.00
	Somewhat	7	35	40.78	11	12	50.00	9	60.00
	No	9	21	29.13	4	1	10.87	3	20.00

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

** Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per student was given.

Problems in Reading and Studying

Following Directions (See Table 10)

Although the majority of these students, 100 (60.96%), said that they had no difficulties following directions, 122 (74.42%) felt that spoken directions for class assignments were not sufficient and that they needed written directions as well.

Vocabulary (See Table 11)

The majority of these students, 111 (67.71%), did not believe with certainty that they had a good general vocabulary, and 98 (59.78%) did not believe with certainty that their vocabulary was adequate for a thorough understanding of different subjects now being studied. Many of these students, 143 (87.23%), frequently found unfamiliar words in their reading, and a good percentage, 109 (66.49%), lacked word perception skills, such as structural analysis.

Comprehension and Study Skills (See Table 12)

Many of these students, 108 (65.88%), had received little or no training in how to read textbooks. There was also an indication that many students, 97 (59.13%), had not learned the skill of skimming and that the majority, 115 (70.15%), had little or no knowledge of how to vary reading rates.

Critical Reading (See Table 13)

One hundred and nine students (66.49%) expressed some difficulty in their ability to identify specific propaganda techniques, and 106 (64.63%) expressed some difficulty in evaluating the writer's ideas and logic; a slightly smaller number of students, 98 (59.74%), indicated that they had some difficulty distinguishing between words used in an emotional way and those used in an informative way; however, the overwhelming majority, 151

TABLE 10

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Following Directions

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Do you have any difficulty following directions?	Yes	3	1	3.88	2	1	6.52	1	6.67
	Somewhat	8	20	27.18	6	6	26.09	3	20.00
	No	17	41	56.31	16	16	69.57	10	<u>66.67</u>
Do you have more difficulty with spoken directions than written directions?	Yes	4	6	9.71	2	4	13.04	3	20.00
	Somewhat	6	16	21.36	6	1	15.22	1	6.67
	No	18	50	66.02	15	18	71.74	10	<u>66.67</u>
Should a teacher use both when making assignments?	Yes	15	39	52.43	12	14	56.62	8	53.33
	Somewhat	4	22	25.24	5	1	13.04	2	13.33
	No	9	11	19.42	5	8	28.26	4	<u>26.67</u>

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

TABLE 11

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Vocabulary

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Do you have a good general vocabulary?	Yes	5	26	30.09	8	5	28.26	4	26.67
	Somewhat	13	37	48.54	6	16	47.83	9	60.00
	No	10	9	18.45	7	2	19.57	2	<u>13.33</u>
Is your vocabulary adequate for the subjects you are now studying?	Yes	8	30	36.89	4	8	26.09	9	60.00
	Somewhat	8	30	36.89	5	9	30.44	6	40.00
	No	11	11	21.36	7	6	28.26	5	<u>33.33</u>
Do you find many unfamiliar words while reading?	Yes	21	29	48.54	14	11	54.35	10	66.67
	Somewhat	7	31	36.89	6	12	39.13	2	13.33
	No	2	12	13.59	3		6.52	3	<u>20.00</u>
Do you know how to use clues to get the meaning of words?	Yes	11	45	54.37	15	12	58.69	5	33.33
	Somewhat	12	22	33.01	3	10	28.26	8	53.33
	No	5	5	9.71	5	1	13.04	2	<u>13.33</u>
Are you able to analyze word elements to determine the meaning of words?	Yes	9	25	33.01	6	6	26.09	5	33.33
	Somewhat	15	39	52.43	12	14	56.62	8	53.33
	No	4	8	11.65	6	1	15.22	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do you know how to use the dictionary as a pronunciation aid?	Yes	23	60	80.58	19	18	80.44	12	80.00
	Somewhat	3	7	9.71	3	3	13.04	3	20.00
	No	2	5	6.79	1	2	6.52		

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

TABLE 12

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Comprehension and Study Skills

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Have you received training in how to use textbooks?	Yes	12	28	38.83	7	3	21.74	3	20.00
	Somewhat	6	13	18.45	3	9	26.09	5	33.33
	No	10	31	39.80	13	11	52.17	7	<u>46.67</u>
Do you know the purpose of different parts of a book?	Yes	23	58	78.64	22	19	89.13	14	93.33
	Somewhat	5	8	12.62	3	2	10.87	1	6.67
	No		6	5.82	2	2	8.69		
Have you learned the skill of skimming?	Yes	10	33	41.75	6	7	28.26	4	26.67
	Somewhat	8	20	27.18	11	11	47.83	6	40.00
	No	9	19	27.18	6	4	21.74	3	<u>20.00</u>
Do you have a well defined purpose while reading?	Yes	7	32	37.86	9	11	43.48	5	53.33
	Somewhat	14	35	47.57	12	11	50.00	7	46.67
	No	6	4	9.71	2	1	6.52	2	<u>13.33</u>
Are you able to find the main idea of a paragraph?	Yes	12	47	57.28	12	13	54.35	6	40.00
	Somewhat	15	20	33.98	9	8	36.96	8	53.33
	No	1	5	5.82	2	2	8.69	1	<u>6.67</u>
Are you able to read for details?	Yes	11	41	50.48	12	12	52.17	6	40.00
	Somewhat	10	23	32.04	10	9	41.31	6	40.00
	No	6	11	16.50	1	2	6.52	3	<u>20.00</u>
Are you able to see the main relationships between ideas?	Yes	7	37	42.72	11	14	54.35	5	33.33
	Somewhat	8	30	36.89	11	9	43.48	9	60.00
	No	4	7	10.68	2		4.35	1	<u>6.67</u>

TABLE 12
(continued)

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Comprehension and Study Skills

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Do you know how to outline?	Yes	15	39	52.43	10	10	43.48	5	33.33
	Somewhat	8	27	33.98	11	11	47.83	9	60.00
	No	4	9	12.62	2		4.35	1	<u>6.67</u>
Do you know how to take notes?	Yes	11	44	53.39	18	12	65.22	4	26.67
	Somewhat	11	24	33.98	9	11	43.48	9	60.00
	No	4	4	7.77	1		2.17	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do you know how to summarize what you have read?	Yes	14	45	57.28	12	12	52.17	9	60.00
	Somewhat	9	22	30.09	7	11	39.13	4	26.67
	No	4	4	7.77	3		6.52	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do you know how to read tables, graphs, and charts?	Yes	10	43	51.46	9	12	45.65	8	53.33
	Somewhat	9	30	37.86	11	9	43.48	5	33.33
	No	9	1	9.71	3	2	10.87	2	<u>13.33</u>
Do you know how to find information in the library?	Yes	21	57	75.73	16	11	58.69	12	80.00
	Somewhat	5	14	18.45	7	10	36.96	2	13.33
	No	1	3	3.88		2	4.35	1	<u>6.67</u>
Do you know how to organize information?	Yes	6	37	41.75	9	8	36.96	10	66.67
	Somewhat	16	31	45.63	14	13	58.69	4	26.67
	No	5	6	10.68		2	4.35	1	<u>6.67</u>
Can you apply what you read to problem solving?	Yes	13	46	57.28	5	11	34.78	8	53.33
	Somewhat	12	26	36.89	14	11	54.35	6	40.00
	No	3	2	4.85	4	1	10.87	1	<u>6.67</u>

TABLE 12
(continued)

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Comprehension and Study Skills

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%**	0.3	%
Do you know how to apply variable reading rates?	Yes	5	26	30.09	8	5	28.26	4	26.67
	Somewhat	12	35	45.63	11	15	56.62	10	66.67
	No	10	14	23.30	4	3	15.22	1	6.67
Do you remember what you read?	Yes	8	37	43.69	8	9	36.96	10	66.67
	Somewhat	18	34	50.48	15	13	60.87	5	33.33
	No	1	3	3.80		1	2.17		

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

** Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per student was given.

(92.11%), stated that they had little or occasional difficulty differentiating fact from opinion.

TABLE 13

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Critical Reading

QUESTION	RESPONSE	CAI			PI			LI	
		0.3	1.1	%	0.3	1.1	%	0.3	%
Do you consider the author qualified to write on his subject?	Yes	11	31	40.76	6	39	13	6	40.00
	Somewhat	13	36	49.51	10	16	56.62	7	46.67
	No	3	5	7.77	1	1	4.35	1	6.67
Do you know what the author's purpose is in writing?	Yes	11	29	38.83	13	6	41.31	7	46.67
	Somewhat	13	43	54.37	7	16	50.00	10	66.67
	No	4	2	5.82		1	2.17		
As you read, can you differentiate fact from opinion?	Yes	12	47	57.28	16	14	65.22	11	73.33
	Somewhat	12	21	32.04	7	9	34.78	2	13.33
	No	4	5	8.74				1	6.67
Can you distinguish between words used in informative and those in emotional ways?	Yes	11	29	38.83	7	10	36.96	6	40.00
	Somewhat	11	32	41.75	10	10	43.48	6	40.00
	No	5	13	17.47	6	3	19.57	2	13.33
Are you able to identify specific propaganda techniques?	Yes	9	22	30.09	6	7	28.26	8	53.33
	Somewhat	10	43	51.46	13	10	50.00	6	40.00
	No	7	9	15.53	6	5	23.91		
Do you question the accuracy of what you read?	Yes	8	29	35.92	7	8	32.61	7	46.67
	Somewhat	15	36	49.51	11	13	73.91	7	46.67
	No	4	9	12.62	5	1	13.04		

TABLE 13
(continued)

PROBLEMS IN READING AND STUDYING
Critical Reading

QUESTION	RESPONSE	LI			PI				LI	
		0.3	1.1	%*	0.3	1.1	%		0.3	%
Do you know how to critically evaluate the writer's ideas and logic?	Yes	3	38	39.80	5	4	19.57		4	26.67
	Somewhat	16	30	44.66	10	13	54.35		9	50.00
	No	8		13.59		5	23.91		1	11.11

* Percentages may not equal 100% because of rounding-off and/or because of a percentage not responding to an item.

PART IV
ANALYSIS OF DATA

Reading Test (See Tables 14, 15)

In discussing Form Am of the Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), it must be noted that for purposes of this study a word knowledge and a reading comprehension score of 9.0 grade equivalent was considered the minimum score necessary for successful completion of introductory college level work.

Table 14, which shows the frequency distribution of the MAT reading scores according to class, illustrates the differences in scores between the individual classes as well as the differences between the 0.3 and 1.1 groups.

As can be seen in Table 15, the range of word knowledge mean scores was 8.45 grade equivalent for the 0.3 LI group to 10.38 grade equivalent for the 1.1 CAI group. The MAT reading mean scores ranged from 8.61 grade equivalent for the 0.3 LI group to 9.57 grade equivalent for the PI 1.1 group. The percentage of students who fell below the minimum 9.0 grade equivalent score is given in Table 15. It can be seen that the 0.3 groups contained a larger percentage of students not capable of doing minimally acceptable college level work than did the 1.1 groups. Also it should be noted that a larger percentage of students earned scores below 9.0 grade equivalent on the word knowledge sub-test as compared with the reading comprehension sub-test.

What is interesting is the large variability within two of the groups. The 0.3 PI's and the 0.3 CAI's show a considerable spread of reading scores. These large variances indicate that large group or non-individualized

TABLE 14

READING SCORE FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION

		<u>WORD KNOWLEDGE</u>										<u>READING COMPREHENSION</u>											
		3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	12.0	3.0	4.0	5.0	6.0	7.0	8.0	9.0	10.0	11.0	12.0		
N		3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	11.9	12.9	3.9	4.9	5.9	6.9	7.9	8.9	9.9	10.9	11.9	12.9	Class	
(14)		1	1	2	1	2	1	2	4	2	1	1		2	1	1	4	2	3			0.3 CAI	
(12)			1	1	2	1	3	1				1	1	2	4	1	1	2	1	1	2	0.3 PI	
(10)			1	3	3		3								1	1	4	3	1			0.3 PI	
(10)		2	2	2	1	1		2				1		3	2	2	1	1	1			0.3 CAI	
(12)			3	1	4	1	3					1	1	1	2	4	2	1				0.3 LI	
(7)		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	2	1			0.3 CAI	
(12)			1		3	3		2	3				1		2	4	3	2				1.1 CAI	
(13)			1		1	4	1	3	3			1		2		2	4	2	4			1.1 CAI	
(16)			1	1	2	1	9	2				1	1	2		2	6	3	3			1.1 PI	
(13)		1		1		5	5					1				2	5	5	1			1.1 CAI	
(15)				2		9	4					1	1		3	2	6	2				1.1 CAI	
(17)			6	2	3	5	1							2	7	3	4	1				1.1 CAI	
(6)			1		2	1	2					1				1	2	2	2			1.1 PI	
Total	1	5	12	9	28	16	39	30	17	(167)		2	7	9	7	10	34	32	34	22		(167)	

Arabic numbers refer to actual frequencies

TABLE 15

METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT TEST (MAT) RESULTS FOR 1.1 AND 0.3 GROUPS

GROUP (N)=138*	MAT-WORLD KNOWLEDGE			MAT-READING COMPREHENSION			
	MEAN (Grade Equivalent)	STANDARD DEVIATION	PERCENTAGE BELOW 9.0 G.E.	MEAN (Grade Equivalent)	STANDARD DEVIATION	PERCENTAGE BELOW 9.0 G.E.	
1.1 PI (18)	10.28	1.39	28%	10.57	2.00	12%	
1.1 CAI (62)	10.38	1.64	23%	10.46	1.82	10%	
0.3 PI (17)	9.12	1.84	65%	9.33	1.84	41%	
0.3 CAI (27)	9.07	2.31	52%	11.62	11.84	48%	
0.3 LI (14)	8.45	1.46	67%	8.61	2.39	42%	

* These data are for students for whom themes were available.

instruction would most probably have been unsuccessful. Also, it may be assumed that large group instruction would have been boring for the more capable students and beyond the comprehension of the less capable students. Thus, an individualized instructional mode of instruction would increase the probability of student success.

Pre- and Post-Tests on Gross Errors (See Table 16)

In addition to the MAT, a pre- and post-test, in gross errors was developed for the project and was administered to provide information regarding specific writing skill deficiencies. As with the MAT results, a comparison of the 0.3 and 1.1 scores indicated that there were a greater number of errors made by the 0.3 groups than there were by the 1.1 groups. The scoring of the tests was such that a high score indicated few errors while a low score indicated many errors.

The pre-test scores for the 1.1 groups were significantly higher on the post-tests than they were on the pre-tests. This was not the case for the 0.3 groups. Table 16 shows the means and standard deviations for the groups. It is noteworthy that the post-test scores earned by the 0.3 students were still not at the level of the 1.1 pre-test scores. This shows that, at the end of the course, the 0.3 classes could still be identified as requiring more intensive remediation.

Comparison of Errors on Themes 1 and 8 (See Table 17)

Each of the students in all five groups was required to write eight themes during the course of the semester. Each instructor corrected his students' themes in terms of 12 possible errors. These errors were as follows:

TABLE 16
PRE- AND POST-TEST OF GROSS ERRORS

GROUP	N	PRE-TEST		POST-TEST	
		MEAN- Raw Score*	Standard Deviation	MEAN- Raw Score	Standard Deviation
1.1 PI	18	11.09	6.35	13.02**	4.65
1.1 CAI	62	11.31	5.67	15.43**	6.00
0.3 PI	17	7.70	4.31	7.39	3.83
0.3 CAI	27	7.64	4.77	7.12	5.29
0.3 LI	14	7.39	4.14	8.85	3.81

* Possible maximum raw score is 36

** Pre and Post Tests are significantly different ($P = < .05$)

1. The Run-On Sentence
2. The Sentence Fragment
3. Incorrect Principal Parts of the Verb
4. Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs
5. Lack of Agreement of Subject and Verb
6. Incorrect Case of Pronouns
7. Vague or Indefinite Pronominal Reference
8. Dangling Elements
9. Misplaced Modifiers
10. Errors in the Comparative Forms of Adjectives and Adverbs
11. Double Negatives
12. Lack of Agreement of Pronoun and Its Antecedent

Table 17 summarizes the percentage of errors within the first theme (theme 1) and the last theme (theme 8) made by the students in each of the groups. Thus, 12 percent of the theme 1 errors of the 1.1 PI group were in the error 1 category, whereas the 0.3 LI group had 18 percent of its errors in this category.

As can be seen, most of the errors were in the 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 categories. A negligible number of errors occurred in the other categories. Within themes 1 and 8, error 3 was the most frequent, occurring a minimum of 14% for the first theme of the 1.1 CAI group and a maximum of 48% for the last theme of 0.3 LI group. Error 1 is the next most prevalent error.

Time on Computer and Theme Writing Achievement (See Table 18)

Since theme 1 and theme 8, for purposes of the present pilot study, were used as pre- and post-criterion measures, it was decided to analyze the ratings earned with the time spent at the CAI terminals. The CAI students were divided into two types of categories. The first grouping was according to difference in sentence structure between themes 1 and 8. The second grouping was based on the overall ratings of themes 1 and 8. The time spent at the terminals was the criterion.

TABLE 17

COMPARISON OF ERRORS ON THEMES 1 AND 8

THEME	GROUP	1.1 PI (N = 18)		1.1 CAI (N = 68)		0.3 PI (N = 23)		0.3 CAI (N = 31)		0.3 LI (N = 15)	
		1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
1.	The Run-On Sentence	0.12	0.24	0.12	0.18	0.40	0.46	0.16	0.22	0.18	0.20
2.	The Sentence Fragment	0.13	0.20	0.14	0.08	0.14	0.10	0.14	0.09	0.20	0.20
3.	Incorrect Principal Parts of the Verb	0.23	0.25	0.14	0.28	0.15	0.21	0.21	0.16	0.41	0.48
4.	Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs	0.00	0.03	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.00
5.	Lack of Agreement of Subject and Verb	0.07	0.20	0.23	0.12	0.19	0.13	0.16	0.26	0.08	0.09
6.	Incorrect Case of Pronouns	0.15	0.00	0.18	0.19	0.03	0.01	0.15	0.15	0.06	0.00
7.	Vague or Indefinite Pronominal Reference	0.00	0.00	0.05	0.02	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.00
8.	Dangling Elements	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01	0.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
9.	Misplaced Modifiers	0.02	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.20	0.00	0.01	0.00	0.00
10.	Errors in the Comparative Forms of Adjectives and Adverbs	0.00	.00	.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.01
11.	Double Negatives	0.16	0.03	0.06	0.05	0.01	0.00	0.04	0.03	0.00	0.00
12.	Lack of Agreement of Pro- noun and Its Antecedent	0.06	0.01	0.99	9.02	9.99	9.02	9.09	0.00	0.01	0.00

* Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding off, and the fact that not all themes were completed by all subjects.

As can be seen, the only significant difference found was in the 0.3 group where theme 8 (sentence structure) was better than theme 1. The difference is for a total of six students who were at the terminals for up to approximately 50 percent more time than other groups. The 0.3 group of students had a total of 874.83 minutes compared to 542.80 minutes for the next highest 1.1 user group.

Factors Noted by Teachers as a Problem (See Table 19)

As can be seen in Table 19, punctuation, mechanics and spelling, combined, was the factor most frequently noted by teachers as causing the most difficulty among students. Little improvement, if any, was shown in this area except for 1.1 CAI group which showed great improvement.

In regard to the other factors, students' ability to express ideas and organize their work tended to become more of a problem as they wrote longer themes (theme 8), except for the 0.3 CAI group which showed no change at all. Sentence structure, except for the 1.1 CAI group and 0.3 PI group, also became a greater problem as students wrote longer themes. Diction or wording, except for 1.1 PI group and 0.3 CAI group, became a greater problem as well as they wrote longer themes. In sum, regardless of mode of instruction, students generally tended to have more problems when they wrote longer themes.

Comparison of Themes 1 and 8 for All Factors According to Mode of Instruction (See Table 20)

As seen in Table 20 the majority of students, approximately 60 per cent in the 1.1 CAI and 1.1 PI groups, were judged to have improved in their writing with the CAI group doing better than the PI group.

TABLE 18

COMPARISON OF OVERALL RATINGS AND SENTENCE STRUCTURE RATINGS ON
THEMES 1 AND 8, IN CONJUNCTION WITH TIME SPENT ON COMPUTER

<u>OVERALL RATINGS</u>				
	0.3		1.1	
	N	Mean Time in min.	N	Mean Time in Min.
Theme 8 superior to Theme 1	3	635.00	16	494.38
No difference between Themes	15	651.00	5	461.20
Theme 1 superior to Theme 8	2	680.00	3	667.33
<u>SENTENCE STRUCTURE</u>				
	0.3		1.1	
	N	Mean Time in Min.	N	Mean Time in Min.
Theme 8 superior to Theme 1	6	874.83*	5	542.80
No difference between Themes	15	544.27	49	522.98
Theme 1 superior to Theme 8	9	478.22	12	418.67

*
F = < .05

TABLE 19

PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF EACH FACTOR NOTED BY TEACHERS AS A PROBLEM*

Theme 1 vs Theme 8

Factor	Group	1.1 PI		1.1 CAI		0.3 PI		0.3 CAI		0.3 I.1	
		N= 18		N=71		N= 24		N= 31		N= 15	
		1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8	1	8
Ideas		0.14	0.12	0.04	0.07	0.02	0.03	0.18	0.11	0.00	
Organization		0.16	0.11	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.16	0.16	0.02	
Sentence Structure		0.11	0.14	0.20	0.17	0.15	0.06	0.17	0.22	0.09	
Wording (Diction)		0.20	0.14	0.12	0.23	0.11	0.18	0.20	0.20	0.35	
Punctuation, Mechanics, and Spelling		0.47	0.45	0.60	0.45	0.70	0.65	0.26	0.25	0.51	

* Percentages may exceed 100% because more than one response per teacher was given.

This was not true, in general, for the 0.3 classes where the majority of the students (approximately 57 percent) exhibited no discernible improvement during the term.

TABLE 20

COMPARISONS OF THEMES 1 AND 8 FOR ALL FACTORS
ACCORDING TO MODE OF INSTRUCTION *

Factor	1.1 PI			1.1 CAI			0.3 PI			0.3 CAI			0.3 LI		
	N= 17			N= 37			N= 20			N= 20			N= 13		
	Theme 1	No 8	Diff	Theme 1	No 8	Diff	Theme 1	No 8	Diff	Theme 1	No 8	Diff	Theme 1	No 8	Diff
Organization	0	12	5	3	26	8	2	13	5	2	9	9	2	7	4
Ideas	0	10	7	3	25	9	0	9	11	1	12	7	2	5	6
Sentence Structure	1	8	8	1	20	16	0	6	14	3	12	5	0	7	6
Wording (Diction)	2	10	5	2	22	13	2	7	11	1	0	19	1	4	8
Punctuation, Mechanics, Spelling	1	8	8	2	17	18	2	5	13	1	2	15	0	4	9
Overall Judgment	1	10	6	4	24	9	0	13	7	2	3	15	2	7	4

NOTE: The number under Theme 1 indicates the number of themes which were better than those labeled 8
The number under Theme 8 indicates the number of themes which were better than those labeled 1

* 107 paired themes were available and were graded by an outside panel of judges.

PART V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This pilot study has presented a comparative analysis of three modes of instruction as given in 13 remedial English classes at Baruch College of The City University of New York in the spring of 1972. It involved seven teachers of remedial English and 167 students. The study secured background information about remedial English students, noted what their goals, interests, attitudes, academic needs and problems were, and examined achievement within and across groups. Within the limited scope of these data, the investigators drew the following conclusions:

1. The majority of these students were high school graduates, holding non-academic diplomas. However, a small number were not high school graduates. A little more than a quarter were Spanish-speaking students. The majority of their parents came from the laborer or blue-collar socio-economic groups. Most of these students sought careers in business.

2. Their extracurricular activities or interests were as follows: approximately 45 percent of these students work; reading appealed to only approximately 12 percent of these students as an extracurricular activity but the majority, approximately 75 percent, did believe that the course should include reading instruction.

3. Their attitudes about grammar and writing reflect a feeling among the majority, 65 percent, that they had problems in grammar. Students were almost equally divided in their attitudes toward writing. The majority felt their high school preparation in these areas was either poor or fair; they also felt these areas were the most difficult for them.

4. Specific factors which contributed to their difficulties with English were as follows: the majority indicated that they were physically tired; that they had difficulty doing school work, in particular, in comprehending and in concentrating; that they had feelings of anxiety about their reading abilities; and that their home environment was not conducive to academic work.

5. Their major reading and study skills problems were as follows: spoken directions alone were not adequate for their understanding of assignments (they also needed written instructions); their vocabulary was inadequate; and they needed more training in how to read textbooks and how to read critically.

6. Although conversations and written statements by teachers were not reported in the body of this paper, the teachers' statements indicated that the students lacked motivation, discipline, and the ability to retain what was learned; students displayed negative self-concepts and immature high school behavior; they also tended toward erratic attendance. In short, all agreed these students were extremely difficult to instruct on a developmental basis.

7. Assuming that 9.0 grade equivalent is a minimally acceptable score for college work, results of the MAT (reading test) reveal that a majority of students, especially those in need of intensive remediation, are not capable of minimal level college work. The MAT results reveal specifically that students have greater difficulty with word knowledge than with reading comprehension.

8. Results of the pre- and post-tests on gross errors in writing reveal that those students in need of a fair amount of remediation did much better on the post-tests than those students in need of intensive

remediation. Those 1.1 classes employing CAI did better than those employing PI, and the 0.3 classes, regardless of mode of instruction, all did about the same.

Post-tests results for 0.3 classes revealed that they were still not at the level of the 1.1 pre-test scores, which indicated they were in need of more intensive remediation before they could be passed on to 1.1 classes.

9. The major errors the students seem to make in writing in order of prevalence are as follows: incorrect principal parts of the verb, run-on sentence, lack of agreement of subject and verb, the sentence fragment, and incorrect case of pronouns. Students appear to make these errors as often, if not more often, in longer themes than in the shorter themes. The data indicate that students generally commit more errors as they engage in longer pieces of writing, regardless of mode of instruction.

10. The small number of students in the 0.3 CAI group who spent the greatest amount of time on the computer did considerably better in improving sentence structure than those who did put in less time on the computer.

11. In evaluating themes, teachers noted most frequently the combination of punctuation, mechanics, and spelling as the factor which caused students most difficulty. Regardless of mode of instruction, students' ability to express ideas and organize their work tended to become more problematic as they wrote longer themes. Sentence structure and diction on longer themes were also greater problems than on shorter themes, except for certain groups using PI and CAI. By generalizing these findings, the investigators observed that PI and CAI offer more promise as modes of instruction in improving sentence structure, diction, punctua-

tion, mechanics and spelling than they offer for improving students' ability to express or organize ideas.

12. Students in need of a fair amount of remediation, using PI and CAI, improved more than those in need of intensive remediation, who used PI, CAI or LI modes of instruction.

13. Although there was measurable writing improvement among some students who needed intensive remediation, there was for the majority no such improvement, regardless of the instructional mode employed. The results imply that the MAT, which revealed that many students lacked college level reading skills, is a fairly good predictor of a students' ability to succeed in the courses used for the experimental situation.

In light of the above findings the investigators recommend the following:

1. Greater Emphasis Upon Reading

The results of the reading test, the students' acknowledgment of their own anxieties about reading, and the students' belief that the course should include the teaching of reading, all indicate that a greater emphasis than has existed to date must be placed upon reading skills in the remedial courses. If English teachers are to give serious consideration to teaching these students how to write, they cannot afford to ignore the teaching of reading.

2. Diagnostic Procedures

Given inadequate reading abilities of these students, teachers must pay attention to the process of diagnosis, for in reality diagnosis serves to dictate the program. That is, through diagnosis, teachers can determine where instruction should begin, by locating the exact status of student's skill mastery in the area of difficulty, learning what special

problems exist, and in what areas, if any, the student is experiencing success. If teachers expect to make intelligent and comprehensive determinations of student abilities, they would do well to pay attention to the three levels of diagnosis; survey, specific, and intensive.

Remediation or instruction should be geared in with diagnosis in order to save time. In short, finding what is wrong should lead as quickly as possible to doing something intelligent about it.

3. Individualized Instruction

The severity of the reading and writing problems of these students demands individualized forms of instruction. PI and CAI, the individualized forms of instruction used in this pilot study, dealt only with the elimination of gross errors from students' writing. However, this individualized material obviously needs to be revised, and better tests will be required to evaluate students' progress. In addition, more attention must be paid to developing materials and tests that would assist in coping with other problem areas, such as reading skills as they relate to the writing of paragraphs and long themes.

4. Restructuring of Remedial Courses

Given the finding that the students in need of intensive remediation (English 0.3), at the completion of the course, were still not capable of doing work at the English 1.1 level and given the finding that these students had such severe reading handicaps, the remedial English program at this level must be restructured to include a full year's work in order to assure that all reading and writing skills are taught in a more cohesive chronological sequence. Certainly, no one can argue that students should not have basic reading skills before they can be expected to master writing skills.

5. Tutorial and Supportive Services

In order to maximize the probability of success of these students, tutorial and supportive services need to be made available. This could be done through the establishment of an Academic Improvement Service Center where tutors and instructors could become aware of students' problems, learn what to do with the information, and learn to give appropriate skills guidance as supplement to subject matter instruction.

6. Additional and More Controlled Research

Further research is required in which additional and more controlled studies of the effectiveness of various modes of instruction can be made. The present pilot study showed that, at the very least, CAI was as effective as other modes of instruction and was better, in a limited way, in improving sentence structure in the writing of long themes. It must be noted that the data amassed for this study are not sufficient to warrant a definitive conclusion.

In doing a more controlled study, investigators may wish to note suggestions emerging from this pilot study:

At the outset, the evaluation team must work with all the instructors in the planning. In the present study the evaluation component was started after the semester was in progress. A good evaluation requires input at all stages of the comparative study.

A closer monitoring of all classes is needed. Because of the nature of the CAI and the necessity of students working at terminals under supervision, CAI was closely monitored throughout the semester. But this was not the case with the non-CAI groups.

There should be a review of criterion measures with possible inclusion of additional measures other than themes. In the present study,

themes were the major criteria. What should be included are objective tests which measure other reading and writing skills. The correction of themes by a panel of judges, however competent, does result in many problems of reliability which could be eliminated or reduced by the use of other more objective criteria.

The conclusions and recommendations pointed out here are by no means complete for we are still in the Dark Ages about what constitutes the learning process and effective method of teaching. For this reason, this pilot study should be considered primarily as an attempt to awaken interest in additional research and to make educators concerned about something they have neglected to do in the past: think seriously about how to teach effectively.

APPENDIXES

THEME RECORD

Number of Theme										
Grade of Theme										
Gross Errors										
The Run-On Sentence										
The Sentence Fragment										
Incorrect Principal Parts of the Verb										
Confusion of Adjectives and Adverbs										
Lack of Agreement of Subject and Verb										
Incorrect Case of Pronouns										
Vague or Indefinite Pronominal Reference										
Dangling Elements										
Misplaced Modifiers										
Errors in the Comparative Forms of Adjectives and Adverbs										
Double Negatives										
Lack of Agreement of Pronoun and Its Antecedent										
Misspelling of Common Words										
Ideas										
Organization										
Sentence Structure										
Wording										
Punctuation and Mechanics										

COMPOSITION SCALE: GRADING STANDARDS

	Ideas	Organization	Sentence Structure	Wording	Punctuation Mechanics Spelling
Superior (A - B)	Thesis statement is significant and clearly stated, supported by concrete and substantial points clearly related to the thesis statement	Plan of the paper is easy to follow, developed with originality and consistent attention to unity, coherence, emphasis	Sentences are well constructed even in varied and complicated sentence patterns	Words are used with correctness and distinctiveness: precisely, economically, imaginatively	Rules of standard English have been observed; clarity and effectiveness of expression are enhanced accordingly
Average (C)	Thesis statement is apparent but insignificant or general, supported by points which are not fully explained and which are occasionally repetitious and irrelevant	Plan of paper is apparent but not consistently fulfilled. Something inconsistent in attention to unity, coherence, emphasis	Sentences are usually correct in more familiar patterns but lack distinction	Words are generally appropriate but lack imagination and economy	Rules of standard English are violated occasionally which tend to weaken clarity and effectiveness of expression
Unacceptable (D - F)	Thesis statement is lacking or confused and points, if any, not explained or are repeated or irrelevant	Plan of paper is not apparent and is undeveloped. No attention is paid to unity, coherence, emphasis	Sentences reflect major errors, such as fused and incomplete and tend to be monotonous or childish	Words are used carelessly or inexactly and reflect substandard childish quality	Basic rules of standard English are violated to a degree that communication is obscured

POWER

One's goal is to achieve Right in the World where equality is first but one must realize A man is a man. When one finds a man that has reached the heights, this is when greed and Vast wealth, overpowers than one's heart and Man Emotion plays No Role; This is When one Says "Power Corrupts, and absolute Power Corrupts absolutely" No one man Can obtain Such Power without using it for his Own Personal gains and uses.

"What I Hope to Obtain By Attending Baruch College"

Why attending Baruch College I hope to obtain the following objectives. A Bachelor of Business Administration Degree with Accountancy is my major. A better grasp of English grammar, speech composition writing ect. Because these are skills I need to better advance myself in my future aims.

Why Students Cheat

One reason students cheat is that sometimes they don't get to study and they want to pass, the next reason is cause they probably don't understand or are just too lazy. I think from my experience that most students cheat cause they don't understand and don't want to fail so they think that the best way of passing is by cheating. Other people might think different casue they might do it in other ways. Cheating don't get people no where but some think is the best way out of studying. I think another reason is that they study so hard and hard that when it comes for a test or to answer questions everything goes blank for the person. I don't think the best way out is cheating but the way people function.

"The Morality of abortion"

In today's generation abortion has became very common not only because many people don't want to have and cannot afford as many children, but because a lot of the young teenagers became pregnat and certainly cannot have an eligemate child.

This aspect of abortion been so freedly is good, but the morality is going down. Many people think that is as if you commit murder because of whatever period you are pregnat there is already a live that is living. I think this is up to the individual and what is the situation in which its stands.

I don't see any reason why in ... as many girls that don't want to have children get pregnat. There are so many contraceptives that she or him can use. Some of this women may be very sensitive and are risking

a great deal by going into this procedure. Others may affect them Psychologically, that mean in one way or other some people is to get hurt.

Why Students Cheat

Cheating has, and will remain, an integral part of the learning process. Although there is great satisfaction in receiving a high grade on your own, receiving a high grade is important enough. The American school system is structured in such a way that a great degree of competition exists. Whether or not the student gets any constructive knowledge out of the course seems to be a secondary premise. Marks are so highly regarded, that students must go to extremes to receive good ones. If the grading system within our schools were on a pass-fail basis, the competition among students would be decreased. In turn, students would turn their attention to learning instead of achieving high grades. If they would not have to strive for high grades, they would not cheat.

Another important reason for students cheating is the way that the individual students lifestyle has been structured. Cheating is the easy way out, something that a lazy person looks for. If the student is lazy at home and at other outside activities, the chances are that he will bring his laziness to the schoolroom. It is this student that does most of the cheating.

The sociological background of a student could also have a great degree of influence of him wanting to cheat. If the student is poor, and has to work after school, his time for studying must be decreased. If he can't do the necessary studying, the chances are that he too will cheat.

Finally, the ultimate in influences is the teacher. Throughout my school life, I have come in contact with many types of teachers with many styles. What it comes down to is if the teacher lets the students get away with cheating, they will cheat.
